



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2018

No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House, enlighten their hearts, and give them the light and strength to know Your will and make it their own.

Guide them by Your wisdom and support them with Your power. For You desire justice for all, and we ask You to enable them to uphold the rights of all.

May they not be misled by ignorance nor corrupted by fear or favor but, rather, faithful to all that is true. As they work through this day and these weeks, may they temper justice with love, and may all their deliberations be pleasing to You.

May all that is done within these hallowed Halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal. The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING LAWRENCE LAURENZI

(Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American and good friend of mine, Lawrence J. Laurenzi.

After 36 years of service to the Department of Justice and the Western District of Tennessee, Larry is retiring from his post as the first assistant United States attorney. Larry Laurenzi has served under 6 Presidents, 11 Attorneys General, 9 United States attorneys; and on four separate occasions, he has acted as the United States attorney during times of vacancy.

During my time as the United States attorney, I saw firsthand Larry's strong work ethic and his dedication to making west Tennessee a safer place and defending the United States of America. Without a doubt, Larry Laurenzi is a true public servant.

While Larry soon will no longer be a Federal prosecutor, I know that he will never stop working to make his community a better place. I will always be grateful for the time that we worked together. I wish Larry; his wife, Pam; and their whole family the best as they begin their next exciting chapter of life.

Congratulations, Larry.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, prescription drug prices are skyrocketing. Every day, constituents tell me about outrageous prices they are forced to pay for medications just to stay healthy.

Janice from Albany, in my district, wrote me last year about a drug she takes to manage her mental illness. Her monthly cost went from \$9 to \$342.

Irene from Hagaman has said her monthly prescriptions have jumped from \$35 to \$250.

Regina from Rexford saw the monthly cost of her rheumatoid arthritis medicine jump from \$2,800 to \$3,700 in just one year. That is a bad deal.

Every Member of this body has heard these stories. Despite these cries for help from our constituents, Congress has failed to act. President Trump made lowering prescription drug prices a centerpiece of his campaign. What has he done about it?

America leads the world in developing new and innovative lifesaving cures, something we should be proud to continue; but many of our own citizens don't have real access to those innovative treatments. That is a bad deal. Drug pricing is complex, but in the richest Nation on Earth, no one should have to go bankrupt to obtain lifesaving medicine. We have to do better.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3889

We need greater transparency, more aggressive negotiation, no more pay-for-delay on generic drugs, and more. Democrats have a better deal to offer the American people.

IN MEMORY OF PETER HUIZENGA

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration and commemoration of the life of Peter Huizenga from Oak Brook, Illinois, who passed away last Wednesday at the age of 79.

A businessman, entrepreneur, and philanthropist, Peter Huizenga is best known for building Waste Management, Inc., into the largest waste disposal company in the world with his cousin Wayne. Upon immigrating to the United States in the 1800s, his Dutch ancestors saw a need for sanitation services in their community west of Chicago. Their humble family garbage collection business would become a Fortune 500 company under Peter's management, employing 75,000 workers worldwide. However, Peter once said: My goal is not to make money but to make a better world.

Following the sale of the company, Peter devoted his life to philanthropic work in the community through organizations such as Big Shoulders Fund; his alma mater, Timothy Christian School; and many more. His family was always his first priority, and he will be greatly missed by his wife, Heidi; his 4 children; and his 10 grandchildren. All of Illinois will miss him.

HONORING MIGNON CLYBURN

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and thank Federal Communications Commissioner Mignon Clyburn for her 9 years of service at the Federal Communications Commission. During her tenure, she fought tirelessly for consumers. She has been a staunch defender of the public interest and a critical voice in the fight for a free and open Internet.

Over the last year, thousands of constituents reached out to me expressing their concerns about rolling back net neutrality provisions. When Chairman Pai denied my request to appear at the Commission's open meeting during which they would be voting to eliminate net neutrality, Commissioner Clyburn offered to submit my written statement for the record so my constituents' voices would be heard. Additionally, she came to my district to hear firsthand from my constituents about net neutrality.

I am also grateful for her work to protect the Lifeline program. Over 56,000 households in my district rely on this crucial program. Connectivity is a

gateway for economic opportunity. It is an equalizer. And Commissioner Clyburn's leadership has been vital.

Thank you, Commissioner Clyburn, for your incredible work and public service.

THE PENSION CRISIS

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the pension crisis facing American workers and businesses across the country and the urgent need for Congress to act.

Men and women in my home State of Michigan and across the country worked a lifetime to retire with the dignity and security promised by their pensions. They earned their retirement with blood, sweat, tears, and many sacrifices along the way. They played by the rules, they put money into their pension, and now they are scared to death about how and what they will live on. They are worried about whether they will have a safe and secure retirement.

A few months ago, we created the Joint Select Committee on the Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans with the goal of coming up with a bipartisan solution to the pension crisis by year's end. This is an urgent task because, if we do not act this year, the major multiemployer plans will start going under, and it could drag the entire economy down with it. Not only would we face staggering benefit cuts for retirees, but it will mean less money flowing in local economies and more people relying on the social safety net for support. It could be the perfect storm.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3053.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 879 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3053.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0910

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3053) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROTHFUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I am going to have a lot of people wanting to come to the floor, so I will abbreviate my opening remarks and just address a few questions that are going to be raised.

First, I just want to highlight the fact that you are going to hear a lot about local, consensus-based decision-making, and then you are also going to hear about closeness of proximity. This chart kind of highlights what we are talking about.

The red is Federal Government land. The Federal Government land is larger than 31 countries on the Earth. You have three different sections. You have the national test and training range. You have the national security site. You have also some Fish and Wildlife/Interior land, bigger than many of our States in our Union. So, to my colleagues, I want to make sure they have in perspective the size of the area that we are talking about: bigger than the State of Connecticut and areas that people are going to talk about.

That is one question that will be addressed. Another question will be the fear of tourism, because Las Vegas gets 42 million tourists a year, and they seem to be concerned that this might affect that industry. And then it dawned on me that the city of Chicago gets 55 million tourists a year—55 million—and they have over 10,000 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel in Chicagoland.

So I want to make sure that my friends in Nevada understand that that should not be a terrible concern when Chicago seems to be doing well with tourism on that issue.

Also, there will be a debate about transportation. I just want to call attention, Mr. Chairman, through you to my colleagues that we operate a nuclear Navy. That nuclear Navy has to have the power systems refueled. That means new nuclear fuel goes there. That means spent nuclear fuel goes off the nuclear Navy ships. That is on the ocean. That is either on the Atlantic Ocean or on the Pacific Ocean. This spent fuel goes to Idaho, which means that we transport, safely, spent nuclear fuel, and we have done it for decades.

Those are the three main contentions you will hear with this bill. I am going to allow my colleagues to talk about all the great benefits of this bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2017.
Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP: On June 28, 2017, the Committee on Energy and Commerce ordered favorably reported H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017. This bill was additionally referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

I ask that the Committee on Natural Resources not insist on its referral of the bill so that H.R. 3053 may be scheduled for consideration by the Majority Leader. This concession in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Natural Resources represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report and in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and for the extraordinary cooperation shown by you and your staff over matters of shared jurisdiction. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2017.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which was additionally referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

In the interest of permitting you to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration, I will allow the Committee on Natural Resources to be discharged from further consideration of the bill. I do so with the understanding that the Committee does not waive any jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the bill that fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Natural Resources to any conference committee to consider such provisions. Finally, please include this letter in the report on the bill and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Thank you again for the very cooperative spirit in which you and your staff have worked regarding many issues of shared interest over the Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 13, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 3053, Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which was additionally referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

I appreciate your willingness to waive your committee's further consideration of H.R. 3053, and I agree that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Armed Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the legislation which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I will urge the Speaker

to name members of your committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

In addition, I agree that the DOE Record of Decision concerning rail corridor siting will not impinge on the activities of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy at the Nevada Nuclear Security Site and the Nevada Test and Training Range.

Finally, I will place a copy of your letter and this response into the committee report on H.R. 3053 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 13, 2017.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3053, the "Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017." There are certain provisions in the bill which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important legislation, I am willing to waive this committee's further consideration of H.R. 3053. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Armed Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the legislation which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

The decision to waive this committee's consideration is also based, in part, on an agreement with the Committee on Energy and Commerce that the DOE Record of Decision concerning rail corridor siting will not impinge on the activities of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy at the Nevada Nuclear Security Site and the Nevada Test and Training Range.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest, and our mutual understanding that a rail siting will not impede DoD and DoE sites, into the committee report on H.R. 3053 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

First, let me recognize the hard work done by Mr. SHIMKUS on this bill. He has been tireless in this effort. And to his and his staff's credit, he has worked with us to make what I believe are a number of improvements to the given bill. Regardless of your position on nuclear energy, we have to acknowledge the reality that tens of thousands of tons of waste already exist. This is a problem for over 120 host communities across our country, and it will not be solved by continuing to ignore it.

□ 0915

But even if you do not represent one of those communities, all of our con-

stituents are paying for this waste. Decades ago, the Federal Government entered into agreements to remove it from nuclear plants. Deadlines have been missed, and now all taxpayers have a legal liability of over \$34 billion, which is being paid from the Treasury's Judgment Fund.

In my view, the most important thing this bill does is set up a path forward on interim storage, which will allow spent nuclear fuel to be stored in a consolidated location on a temporary basis while a permanent repository is pursued.

The bill includes language based upon a proposal developed by our colleague, DORIS MATSUI, to allow the Secretary of Energy to enter into an agreement to establish an interim storage pilot program, which can move forward directly after enactment.

Consolidating waste at a small number of sites instead of 121 communities across our country will help ensure waste is managed more safely and securely while allowing those 121 sites to begin to be redeveloped for other purposes.

I know a number of our colleagues have concerns with this bill, and I understand their position. And many Members that support this bill, including myself, have not passed judgment on the merits or final disposition of the Yucca Mountain project. That is why Members of the minority demanded a number of troubling Nevada-related provisions be removed from the bill during the committee process.

This bill will not rubber-stamp the Yucca permitting application. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission will still need to adjudicate the many remaining issues with the application, and it will need appropriations in order to do so.

I know we will hear about the challenges of transporting spent fuel to a final repository, but the reality is nuclear material is already moved around our country today without incident due to strict safety requirements. The only alternative to not moving this waste is keeping it spread out in 121 locations for tens of thousands of years.

Overall, this bill is a step in the right direction toward beginning to address our Nation's very difficult nuclear waste issues, which is why it was reported out of committee by a vote of 49-4.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the full Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the chairman on the Subcommittee on Environment, Mr. SHIMKUS, whose, I think, life's work is on the floor today in many respects. Nobody has been more tenacious in this effort to get permanent,

safe, and secure nuclear waste storage for America than JOHN SHIMKUS, and so I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for his good work there.

The bill we are considering today reinforces the promise that the United States Congress, on behalf of the Federal Government, made to our constituents a generation ago. Today, we are keeping that promise. We will accept responsibility for and properly dispose of radioactive waste.

This is long overdue. Americans across the country, from Maine to southern California, from Florida to the Pacific Northwest, are watching today, and they are expecting us to act.

The Department of Energy's Hanford site is just up the mighty Columbia River from where I live and where I grew up. That area and those workers helped us win World War II, and the site's nuclear program was instrumental in projecting peace through strength throughout the Cold War.

While the community has been a constructive partner in support of our vital national security missions, it did not agree to serve as a perpetual storage site for the resulting nuclear waste. Fifty-six million gallons of toxic waste sitting in decades-old metal tanks at Hanford—these are those tanks that were being constructed to hold this waste. They are now buried in the ground. The only entry point is right here.

The amount of waste stored at Hanford would fill this entire House Chamber 20 times over. According to a recent Government Accountability Office report, the oldest of these tanks, some of which date back to the 1940s, have single-layer walls or shells. They were built to last 20 years. They will be almost 100 years old by the estimated end of their waste treatment.

The Department of Energy has reported that 67 of these tanks are assumed or known to have leaked waste into the soil. There is an understandable sense of urgency in the Northwest behind the cleanup efforts that are under way at Hanford.

H.R. 3053 will provide the pathway to clean up the contaminated Hanford site. You see, the waste from Hanford will end up in a secure permanent storage site that we believe will be Yucca Mountain. These tanks will be drained and cleaned out, the waste classified and put away.

This bill keeps our commitment to energy consumers, too, who are legally bound to pay for a nuclear waste management program. These consumers in 34 States, including Oregon, have paid the Federal Government in excess of \$40 billion. Even after the last administration stalled the project, ratepayers continued to hand over nearly \$800 million annually to develop the repository, until finally the courts stepped in and directed the fee collection be halted because no repository was being constructed. That money was paid to the U.S. Treasury for a specific pur-

pose. We have a legal and moral obligation to advance the program for which ratepayers paid.

Now, my friends in Nevada should have confidence the Yucca Mountain repository will protect public health and the environment. The completion of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's impartial safety review will answer the many questions raised by the State of Nevada and provide an independent determination if the site meets the required 1-million-year environmental protection standard. That is right, 1 million years.

Consolidating the Nation's nuclear material for disposal is better for the environment than the status quo, where these materials sit around in 121 communities in 39 States, or tanks like this.

The legislation authorizes the Department of Energy to contract with private companies to store nuclear waste while DOE finishes the rigorous scientific analysis of the repository design and the associated Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensing process. An interim storage facility can bring added flexibility to DOE's disposal program and may provide a more expeditious near-term pathway to consolidate spent nuclear fuel.

The longer the government delays, the greater the potential consequences. The legal cost of inaction, a bill paid by every American taxpayer, is staggering. Today, taxpayers pay an average of \$2 million every day—every day—in legal claims because we as a government have not done what was promised decades ago. We are doing that today with this legislation.

Cumulatively, we are on the hook for nearly \$134 billion. That increases every day we delay action. Instead of contributing to an escalating national debt, this money could be better spent to support our men and women in uniform, deal with the opioid crisis, or a whole myriad of other things. By acting today, we will eventually turn off that penalty phase and start the productive phase.

At the end of the day, this bipartisan legislation is good for our communities around the country and their safety. It is good for consumers and fiscal sanity. It is good for the environment for secure storage. It is good for taxpayers, and it is good for national security as well.

So I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have put so much work into this—Mr. TONKO and certainly Mr. SHIMKUS. I urge all our colleagues to support H.R. 3053. Let's put an end to these tanks before they put an end to us.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), our outstanding ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our ranking member, Mr. TONKO.

I rise in support of H.R. 3053. Congress first passed the Nuclear Waste

Policy Act back in 1982, but more than 35 years later, we still do not have a national solution to address the safe storage of spent nuclear fuel. Instead, it continues to sit on site at our Nation's nuclear power plants.

This becomes a concern as more and more nuclear power reactors are scheduled to shut down in the coming years, including the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station in New Jersey. As these reactors shut down, the surrounding communities are realizing that the nuclear waste currently stored at these sites will be there indefinitely when the plant closes, absent a workable national solution. This situation underscores the need for interim storage solutions to bridge the gap until a permanent repository is licensed and constructed.

The bill before us today is a bipartisan compromise that was reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee by a vote of 49–4. Democrats on the committee, especially Representative MATSUI, worked with Mr. TONKO to craft a bipartisan compromise that establishes an interim storage pilot program, which will allow for consolidated temporary storage of spent nuclear fuel, with priority given to waste currently stored at decommissioned nuclear power plants.

This will allow us to consolidate waste at a single site instead of 121 sites in communities around the country. One consolidated site will help ensure it is managed more safely and securely, while allowing communities with decommissioned plants to begin working towards redeveloping those sites.

Now, some of the opponents of this bill have focused on claims that spent nuclear fuel could be transported through many congressional districts across the country, and that is true. Spent nuclear fuel will ultimately need to be transported from power plants to an interim storage facility or repository. But moving nuclear material by rail and truck has occurred frequently for decades, and the NRC notes that thousands of shipments have occurred over decades without incident.

So regardless of your position on the Yucca Mountain project—I know people feel strongly on both sides of that, but regardless, spent nuclear fuel will need to be transported somewhere in the U.S. unless all of the spent fuel is to be left at the site of a nuclear power plant that may no longer even produce power.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a balanced bill that I support, just as it is also supported by the AFL–CIO, the IBEW, and the other building trades. It will begin the process of moving waste out of communities, particularly those home to a shut down nuclear power plant. It will also help fulfill the commitment to taxpayers who have paid more than \$50 billion dollars into the nuclear waste program.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. I thank both Mr. SHIMKUS, the

main sponsor who worked so hard; obviously, Mr. TONKO; Ms. MATSUI; and, of course, the chairman of our committee, Mr. WALDEN, as well.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I particularly commend JOHN SHIMKUS, the chairman of the subcommittee, who helped shepherd this bill through; Chairman WALDEN; Ranking Member PALLONE and others; Mr. TONKO. It is truly a bipartisan work of art; 49-4 is what this bill passed in our committee.

I can remember way back when when President Reagan was in office and signing the Nuclear Waste Policy Act in the Rose Garden. He said: We are going to keep our promise. The Federal Government is going to take care of nuclear waste. That is going to happen.

Well, here we are now nearly 50 years later. I can remember the Upton-Towns bill back in the 1990s, a bill that did very much along the lines of what this bill does. We came within just a vote or two of having it overridden by the U.S. Senate, stopping it in its tracks. So, decades later, here we are again.

In my district, we have two nuclear plants. Both of them have run out of room in their storage, so they have dry casks that are literally a JOHN SHIMKUS baseball throw away from Lake Michigan.

Every one of these 100-some sites across the country is in an environmentally sensitive area, and at some point they are going to run out of room. In Michigan, we have got two other sites that also have dry casks in addition to the two in my district.

So we spent nearly \$40 billion. Enough time has gone by. We need to deal with this. And for those who are against this bill, your alternative is just keeping it there—just keeping it in California, just keeping it on that pristine river, just keep it on the Great Lakes for however long. That is not the answer. This bill is.

Because it is bipartisan, I am confident that not only will we have the votes to get this thing through today, but we are going to get it ultimately to the President.

So, again, I want to thank our leadership on both sides of the aisle for getting this thing done.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3053. I thank Ranking Member TONKO and Chairman SHIMKUS for their hard work on this very difficult subject.

This is a bipartisan bill that seeks a solution on how to remove and dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. This bill recognizes the need to consolidate interim storage in an integral waste management program.

□ 0930

H.R. 3053 authorizes the Department of Energy to either develop its own consolidated interim storage facility or contract with private entities for such development. The bill also authorizes the development of one pilot CIS facility that is not linked to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's decision on the Yucca Mountain license application, and provides a solution for nuclear waste stranded at sites without an operating reactor.

This bill will help us create a path toward permanent storage, while also being inclusive and transparent about the process. One of the key additions to this bill is that it will reestablish the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. It also increases assistance to States and tribes for transportation safety, which is important when transporting radioactive materials.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot continue to put our heads in the sand about nuclear waste. There are about 120 sites across the country that store nuclear waste on a so-called temporary basis. With this situation, a serious accident is virtually inevitable. Nuclear waste can be transported and stored safely for the generations needed. This is really an engineering problem, and America has some of the best engineers in the world. We can do this.

H.R. 3053 is an important step toward safe storage, and I urge my colleagues to support this well-crafted legislation.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Chairman SHIMKUS' bill, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018.

This legislation is important not only because of what it means to the future of clean energy opportunities for this country, but also what this means for our communities. Nuclear energy has become a safe and effective way to generate energy, all while not producing greenhouse gas emissions.

The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act would finally put in place a permanent repository for the waste generated by nuclear energy production that powers millions of homes and businesses across the country. We began this process nearly 30 years ago, and today we move it forward.

My good friend's legislation authorizes the disposal of spent nuclear fuel in a safe, permanent place. Right now, spent fuel is sitting on nuclear energy sites around the country, leaving our communities open to larger vulnerabilities and possible attacks or accidents.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

Finding a way forward on the future of our Nation's nuclear waste storage is no easy task. But I believe we have arrived at a bipartisan agreement on nuclear waste storage that we need to advance today to address this issue.

I would first like to thank Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member PALLONE, and Chairman SHIMKUS and Ranking Member TONKO for their outstanding leadership, and thank all of my colleagues who worked on this in committee because it wasn't easy, but we worked together in a bipartisan way.

This bill will authorize the Department of Energy to establish and maintain interim storage facilities to hold nuclear waste until there is a clear decision on the national repository.

Also, included in this bill is an amendment I offered at the full committee with my good friend, FRED UPTON. This important amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that the governments of the United States and Canada should not allow permanent or long-term storage of spent nuclear fuel or other radioactive waste near the Great Lakes.

Mr. UPTON and I were proud to get this amendment included on behalf of every Member of the Great Lakes region.

The Great Lakes account for 20 percent of the world's fresh water supply, and it is absolutely critical for millions of Americans who rely on them for drinking water, jobs, and their way of life.

Nearly 1/10th of the U.S. population lives in the Great Lakes Basin, and more than 35 million people, with approximately 24 million of them being Americans, rely on the Great Lakes.

This provision reinforces the importance of the healthy Great Lakes Basin, free of nuclear storage.

Mr. Chairman, I commend all of my colleagues one more time for their good work in crafting a bipartisan agreement that will ensure nuclear waste is stored at secure storage facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHIMKUS for his work on this legislation.

I have long been an advocate for nuclear waste policy like this for Yucca Mountain.

Since 1982, when the Nuclear Waste Policy Act was created, ratepayers in this Nation have paid, as part of their utility bill, over \$40 billion. In South Carolina, that means ratepayers have paid \$1.3 billion for the construction and operation of what we now know as Yucca Mountain.

Currently, in South Carolina, there are over 4,500 tons of spent nuclear fuel in temporary storage from commercial reactors. At the Savannah River Site, we have both research and military nuclear waste sitting in vitrified glass ready to go to a long-term repository.

The law of the land, passed in 1992, is for Yucca Mountain to be a long-term repository for this Nation's waste. It is time to move forward and give the ratepayers—not the taxpayers, but the ratepayers—what they paid for, and this legislation moves in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to my colleagues supporting this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. TONKO for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

In Sacramento, our publicly owned utility stores spent nuclear fuel at the Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, despite the fact that the plant has been decommissioned for many, many years, and that the Federal Government has a responsibility to take the fuel.

The continued presence of the spent fuel at Rancho Seco has a direct impact on electricity rates in my district, and prevents the site from being redeveloped. That is why I have continuously been supportive of an interim storage facility for spent fuel.

Today, it is the most viable path to consolidate the fuel housed in over 120 communities across the country. For the last two Congresses, I have cosponsored a bipartisan bill to explicitly authorize the Department of Energy to enter into agreements for consolidated interim storage.

I believe that a stand-alone piece of legislation that creates a pathway for interim storage is the commonsense next step in our national nuclear waste management strategy.

I was opposed to the initial version of H.R. 3053 that came before the Energy and Commerce Committee last year. It tied Yucca Mountain, which I have major concerns with, to interim storage.

Linking these two policies together would effectively maintain the status quo for decommissioned sites across the country, which is unacceptable. That is why I have worked on a bipartisan basis to ensure that the interim storage policy in this bill is decoupled from a permanent repository.

After negotiations in committee, the bill we are considering now authorizes the use of one consolidated interim storage site and creates a path to move spent fuel to that site before a final decision is made on a permanent geologic repository.

It is critically important that we have further clarified the regulatory pathway for interim storage. For that reason, I will be supporting this bill today, despite some of its provisions that I believe are less than ideal.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for working with me in a collaborative and bipartisan manner to ensure the

Federal Government finally takes the spent fuel stranded in so many of our communities nationwide.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), who is on the committee, and has been doing great work to deal with his constituents.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act. This is an enormous achievement for Chairman SHIMKUS, who has worked so hard, and so long, to make this day a reality.

The Nation needs a safe, environmentally conscious plan to dispose of this waste. This plan is bipartisan and sensible.

New Jersey is home to four nuclear reactors at three generating stations: Oyster Creek, Hope Creek, and Salem. Oyster Creek will be closing this October.

In the congressional district I serve, these plants account for about half of the power generation and 90 percent of the carbon-free electricity. New Jersey's nuclear plants avoid 14 million tons of carbon emissions each year.

The Public Service Enterprise Group, FirstEnergy, and Exelon are doing their part in storing their station's spent nuclear fuel on-site, but we need a permanent site. The expertise and know-how of the Federal Government has a responsibility to my constituents and to the American people. I want the 3,000 metric tons of nuclear waste out of New Jersey and consolidated in a national protected facility.

New Jersey ratepayers have contributed nearly \$2 billion to the Department of Energy's Nuclear Waste Fund to dispose of nuclear waste at a permanent repository at Yucca Mountain. My constituents should see a return on that investment. New Jersey is one of the top State contributors to this fund. It is time for the government to hold up its end of the bargain and permanently remove this waste from New Jersey and other States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because I believe that it makes it more likely that a future interim storage site—potentially one in New Mexico—becomes a permanent home for nuclear waste.

I know that these are tough issues, and I agree that we have a responsibility to address the waste issues that result from our country entering the atomic age.

However, addressing nuclear waste is not our only responsibility. Seventy years ago, rural New Mexico became ground zero for the detonation of the first nuclear bomb. This marked the beginning of sickness and suffering for generations of people who lived and grew up in the Tularosa Basin.

"That atomic bomb," Gloria wrote to me, "has caused anguish to so many

people in New Mexico. . . . The people from New Mexico have suffered physically, mentally, and financially. And we are all here in hope that you will find a way to help us."

It has been over 70 years since the Trinity Test. Seventy years, and the Federal Government has done almost nothing to recognize or compensate those impacted by that test. They are not alone.

In 1990, Congress passed the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to begin to right this wrong. However, we have since learned that there are many more individuals who are sick or dying because they worked in the uranium industry, lived near a mining operation, or lived downwind from a test. The Navajo, Hopi, and Yavapai Apache Indian Reservations were particularly affected.

That is why I have repeatedly introduced the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments to compensate those workers. We have had Navajo elders travel out here to Washington, D.C., and ask us in Congress, "Are you waiting for us all to die to solve this problem?" The Rules Committee rejected amendments that I offered.

Why in the world is it that the people of New Mexico, where the first bomb went off, are the only ones that are left out of protections?

People in Nevada, Colorado, and Utah are included, but New Mexico has been left out. The first place the bomb was tested, these people weren't given a warning. All they saw was a light flash when they were in their kitchens or outside working.

Mr. Chairman, this deserves action, and I hope I can work with my colleagues to get this done.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

This bill is an opportunity to give the Department of Defense and our Nation's nuclear plants a proper place to store spent fuel. It also relieves a burden on our nuclear plants, which provide a critical source of resilient base-load power to our electric grid. Furthermore, nuclear plants provide good jobs to communities across the Nation, many of which are in economically distressed areas.

Unfortunately, several nuclear power plants are prematurely closing because of government policies. For a long time, I have repeatedly warned the executive branch about the national security risks if too many plants deactivate. I am glad to hear some Members across the aisle are actually acknowledging this problem, at least partially.

In April, I met with Beaver Valley Nuclear Power Station workers. I told my constituents that I would do everything I can to protect their jobs and the Nation's grid, and I meant it.

This bill addresses some of the uncertainty and added costs the industry

faces, and it is one step in helping to secure those jobs and the reliability and resiliency of our electric grid.

□ 0945

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, today we must decide if you are going to double down on policies that have been an abject failure for the last three decades or if you will chart a new course that doesn't repeat the same mistakes of previous Congresses.

The first "Screw Nevada" bill was passed in 1982, and since that time, Nevada's residents, elected officials, business leaders, and health and environmental groups have steadfastly opposed the Yucca Mountain repository.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD letters from over 100 groups in opposition.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS,
Las Vegas, NV, May 7, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVE SCALISE,
House Majority Whip,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SIRS: In 1987 Congress voted for the Department of Energy (DOE) to build a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain without the support of Nevada. Now, the House of Representatives is planning to consider H.R. 3053, The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act. I am writing to express my vehement opposition to this legislation.

Yucca Mountain would cost U. S. taxpayers billions of dollars and require the dangerous transportation of nuclear waste across every state in the country before it arrives in Nevada, which, by the way, produces no nuclear waste. These transports journey through communities in the nation whose infrastructures are well-known to be rated at the dangerously low, D+ level by highly renowned associations of engineers and scientific professionals. Bridges and tunnels have not been reinforced in decades, railroad tracks are faulty (as we well know!), and roads are beyond needing repair and replacement. No matter the transport vehicle used, the cargo travels on challenged routes which are unknown to the public and at times undeclared!

In my tenure as Mayor, every year I have warned my fellow Mayors of the dangers of this transportation, and every year the Mayors across the nation have passed a resolution at their annual U.S. Conference of Mayors meeting requiring that the U.S. Department of Energy instead focus on deactivating and/or repurposing radioactive waste on site. High-priority research is needed to identify methods for the safe treatment and storage of radioactive waste at origination locations in order to mitigate the health and environmental risks of transporting low, high and mixed level waste to offsite treatment facilities. Even Mayors with nuclear waste on their doorsteps understand the dangers of transporting this waste.

As Mayor of Las Vegas, I am fortunate to preside over a beautiful city that is home to over 600,000 residents in one of the fastest-growing areas in the nation boasting over 2.4 million residents. Additionally, 42 million visitors choose the Las Vegas valley as a destination annually. Yucca Mountain is less

than 100 miles away from this gem in the desert. I believe that DOE's Nuclear Regulatory Commission should be required to have support from state, local and tribal governments before constructing a nuclear waste repository anywhere in the country. Therefore, I urge you and your colleagues to vote down H.R. 3053, which rejects science and ignores our steadfast opposition.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN GOODMAN,
Mayor.

—
LAS VEGAS METRO
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Las Vegas, NV, May 7, 2018.

Re The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018, H.R. 3053.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, MADAM LEADER, CHAIRMAN WALDEN, AND RANKING MEMBER PALLONE: The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce/ ("Metro Chamber") is Nevada's largest and most diverse business organization, representing thousands of employers who employ more than 200,000 Southern Nevadans. As the Voice of Business in our state, its mission is to help Nevada businesses succeed and create jobs. This includes protecting our members from initiatives or legislation at all levels of government that could hinder our state's economy, impede job creation, and hamper development of our local workforce.

As such, the Metro Chamber has been actively engaged with Members of Congress, federal government agencies, Nevada's Constitutional officers, state legislators, local government leaders and entities, trade groups, employers, and residents of the State of Nevada regarding its strong steadfast opposition for more than two decades to the proposed Nuclear Waste Repository Site at Yucca Mountain.

The Metro Chamber's position regarding the proposed Nuclear Waste Repository Site at Yucca Mountain has not changed with the introduction of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. The Las Vegas Metro Chamber continues to strongly oppose a Nuclear Waste Repository at Yucca Mountain, as well as the transportation and storage of any nuclear waste in Nevada, because of the potential negative effect it could have on the safety and health of the visitors and residents of Southern Nevada, as well as the chilling long-term effect it could have on the economy.

The proposed legislation would allow for the storage of approximately 110,000 metric tons of nuclear waste less than 90 miles from Las Vegas, and is a significant concern to the business community and residents as it could pose a national security and health threat. The close proximity of such a facility to Las Vegas could also damage the tourism-based economy of Southern Nevada. In 2017, Southern Nevada hosted approximately 42.2 million visitors, whose direct and indirect economic impact is \$58.8 billion. This translates to about a total of 391,000 jobs and \$16.4 billion in wages for our region. The reality is that Southern Nevada is the economic engine of the State, and it is incumbent on all stakeholders of our region's economy and future prospects for growth to protect the well-being of all of our residents and visitors.

The potential terrorist threats, environmental impacts, and transportation challenges, as well as the safety of storing nuclear waste material, are too great of a risk on our region's economy. Residents and visitors must feel safe in their communities and the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain could fundamentally undermine that safety. Unfortunately, the passage of H.R. 3053 may only elevate Las Vegas' profile for a potential terrorist attack. We cannot risk such a scenario, since any incident with the transport or storage of nuclear waste could have a severe and negative economic impact on Southern Nevada's economy.

The Metro Chamber is also adamantly opposed to the temporary storage of any nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, which includes reprocessed fuel. The reprocessing of nuclear waste requires large amount of water, which is a concern to businesses, local governments, residents and regional water agencies since the region remains in a severe drought.

In addition, Nevada is ranked by the U.S. Geological Survey as the fourth most active seismic area in the United States. The potential for seismic activity in the region raises serious questions about the logic and prudence of storing nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain. Seismic activity in the region is another reason why Yucca Mountain is not a feasible or practical site for the storage of nuclear waste.

The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain should not only be a concern for Southern Nevadans but also for the residents of 329 Congressional Districts in 44 states that nuclear waste shipments must pass through to get to Yucca Mountain. The transport and safety of these shipments need to be part of a national conversation and the potential impacts of any incident during transportation of these casks by rail and truck should not be underestimated. While the people of Southern Nevada have been vigilant about the potential dangers of the transportation of this toxic material, fellow citizens across the country who live in states through which this waste would be transported may not be aware and deserve the opportunity to learn the facts about how this plan would impact their lives and livelihoods.

Thank you for allowing the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce to offer its concerns and strong opposition as associated with the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository Site, as proposed by H.R. 3053.

Sincerely,

MARY BETH SEWALD,
President & CEO.
MICHAEL BOLOGNINI,
Chairman, Board of Trustees.
HUGH ANDERSON,
Chairman, Government Affairs.

MAY 7, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose H.R. 3053, the "Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017" (115th Congress, 1st Session). This bill will put our nation's nuclear waste storage policy on the wrong track yet again. It ignores environmental concerns, states' rights and consent to host the waste in the first instance, and attempts to truncate public review in order to force a "solution"—either Yucca Mountain or a new consolidated interim storage site—that have both proven to be unworkable. Rather than blindly charge forward at the cost of public safety and public resources, we urge Congress to reject this bill and start the important and necessary work on a comprehensive set of hearings to commence building a publicly accepted, consent based repository program.

The bill you will vote on retains the flaws contained in its earlier forms. Some of these harms include unwise efforts to recommence the licensing process for proposed repository at Nevada's Yucca Mountain. This is a project certain to fail the NRC's licensing process due to the geology and hydrology of the site that make it unsuitable for isolating spent nuclear fuel for the required time. Next, the draft legislation suggests going forward with a consolidated storage proposal before working out the details of a comprehensive legislative path to solve the nuclear waste problem, entirely severing the link between storage and disposal, and thus creating, an overwhelming risk that an interim storage site will determine or function as de facto final resting place for nuclear waste. The draft provides no safety, environmental or public acceptance criteria, only speed of siting and expense. This is precisely the formula that produced the failure of the Yucca Mountain process and made it, as the previous administration noted, "unworkable."

Other provisions conflict with the well-established and necessary requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq. Doing so exacerbates the public interest community's (and that of Nevada) objection of the last two decades—that the process of developing, licensing, and setting environmental and oversight standards for the proposed repository has been, and continues to be, rigged or weakened to ensure that the site can be licensed, rather than provide for safety over the length of time that the waste remains dangerous to public health and the environment.

This bill was largely changed for the worse in committee. The bill now sets us on path to go forward in the next few years with a consolidated storage proposal before working out the details of a comprehensive legislative path to solve the nuclear waste problem and, frankly, creates an overwhelming risk that an interim storage site in New Mexico, Utah, or even Texas (although the Texas site just requested that its license application be held in abeyance) will be the de facto final resting place for nuclear waste.

This will not work. It is likely those states will, in some form or another, resist being selected as the dumping ground for the nation's nuclear waste without a meaningful consent based process and regulatory authority that garners both public acceptance and a scientifically defensible solution. Further, and also just as damning, it sets up yet another attempt to ship the waste to Yucca Mountain irrespective of its certain likelihood of failing the regulatory process, or seek to revive the licensed Private Fuel Storage site that has been strongly opposed in Utah or even open up New Mexico's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility for spent nuclear fuel disposal despite strong opposition and contrary to 25 years of federal law. The latter site also was designed and intended for nuclear waste with trace levels of plutonium, not spent fuel (and we note, a site that has already seen an accident dispersing plutonium throughout the underground and into the environment, contaminating 22 workers, and thus the site was functionally inoperable for years). All of this runs precisely counter to the core admonition of the previous administration's Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future ("BRC") that "consent" come first.

The waste will not be going anywhere for years and it should be incumbent on Congress to fix problems in a meaningful fashion, not attempt an expedient solution that is destined to fail, again.

Our concerns, many of which were detailed above or in earlier letters, remain. We would be pleased to work with any representative

on a feasible, constructive path forward, but this legislation would put the nation's nuclear waste storage policy on the wrong track yet again and we urge you to reject it. Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

350Kishwaukee; 350NYC; Abalone Alliance Safe Energy Clearinghouse; Albuquerque Center for Peace and Justice; Alliance for a Green Economy; Alliance for Environmental Strategies; Alliance for Nuclear Accountability; Alliance to Halt Fermi 3; Baltimore Nonviolence Center; Basin and Range Watch; Bellefonte Efficiency & Sustainability Team; Mothers Against TN River Radiation; Beyond Nuclear; California Communities Against Toxics; Cape Downwinders; Chesapeake Physicians for Social Responsibility; Citizen Action New Mexico; Citizen Power; Citizens Action Coalition of IN; Citizens Awareness Network; Citizens Education Project.

Citizens' Environmental Coalition; Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping; Citizens' Resistance at Fermi 2 (CRAFT); Clean Water Action; Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes; Code Pink; Women for Peace; Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety; Concerned Citizens for SNEC Safety; Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone; Consumers Health Freedom Coalition; Council on Intelligent Energy & Conservation Policy; Crabshell Alliance; Cumberland Countians for EcoJustice; CT Coalition Against Millstone; Don't Waste Arizona; Don't Waste Michigan; Ecological Options Network (EON); Energia Mia; Energy Justice Network; Environmental Defense Institute.

Environmental Working Group; Fairmont, MN Peace Group; Food & Water Watch; Frack Free Illinois; Franciscans for Justice; Friends of the Earth; Georgia Women's Action for New Directions (Georgia WAND); Grandmothers Mothers and More for Energy Safety; Great Basin Resource Watch; Great Lakes-Environmental Alliance; Green State Solutions, Iowa; Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action; HEAL Utah; Hip Hop Caucus; Hudson River Sloop Clearwater; Indian Point Safe Energy Coalition; Indigenous Rights Center; Indivisible South Bay Los Angeles; Kawartha lakes land trust; Lacuna Acoma Coalition for a Safe Environment (LACSE).

League of Conservation Voters; League of Women Voters of the United States; LEPOCO Peace Center; Los Alamos Study Group; Mankato Area Environmentalists; Merrimack Valley People for Peace; Michigan Safe Energy Future, Kalamazoo MI Chapter; Michigan Safe Energy Future, Shoreline Chapter; Michigan Stop the Nuclear Bombs Campaign; Milwaukee Riverkeeper; Missouri Coalition for the Environment; Mountain States Mennonite Conference; Multicultural Alliance for a Safe Environment; Native Community Action Council; Natural Resources Defense Council; Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force; New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution; No More Fukushimas; No Nukes NW.

North American Climate, Conservation and Environment (NACCE); North American Water Office; Northwest Environmental Advocates; Nuclear Age Peace Foundation; Nuclear Energy Information Service; Nuclear Free World Committee; Dallas Peace and Justice Center; Nuclear Information and Resource Service; Nuclear Issues Study Group; Nuclear Watch New Mexico; Nuclear Watch South; Nukefree.org; Nukewatch; Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance; On Behalf of Planet Earth our developing world; OurRevolution Ocala; Partnership for Earth Spirituality; Peace Action; Peace Action of

Michigan; Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Physicians for Social Responsibility—Chesapeake; Physicians for Social Responsibility—Kansas City; Physicians for Social Responsibility—Los Angeles; Physicians for Social Responsibility—Oregon; Physicians for Social Responsibility—San Francisco Bay Area Chapter; Pilgrim Legislative Advisory Coalition PLAC; Pilgrim Watch; Planet Cents. Portsmouth/Piketon Residents for Environmental Safety and Security (PRESS); Proposition One Committee; Public Citizen; Public Health and Sustainable Energy (PHASE); Public Watchdogs; Rachel Carson Council; Radiation and Public Health Project; Radiation Truth; Redwood Alliance; Residents Organized for a Safe Environment; Riverkeeper; ROAR (Religious Organizations Along the River).

Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center; Safe Utility Meters Alliance NW (SUMA-NW); San Clemente Green; San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace; San Onofre Safety; Save The River / Upper St. Lawrence Riverkeeper; Seacoast Anti-Pollution League; Sierra Club; Snake River Alliance; Southern Alliance for Clean Energy; Southern Illinois Against Fracturing Our Environment; Southwest Research and Information Center; Stand Up/Save Lives Campaign; Straits Area Concerned Citizens for Peace, Justice and the Environment (SACCPJE); SUN DAY Campaign; Support and Education for Radiation Victims (SERV); Sustainable Energy & Economic Development (SEED) Coalition; Task Force on Nuclear Power, Oregon and Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility; Tennessee Environmental Council; Tewa Women United.

Texas River Revival; The Colorado Coalition for Prevention of Nuclear War; The Lands Council; The Nuclear Resister; The Peace Farm; Thomas Merton Center; Three Mile Island Alert; Toledo Coalition for Safe Energy; Touching Earth Sangha; Toxics Action Center Campaigns; Tri-Valley CARES (Communities Against a Radioactive Environment); Uranium Watch; Ursuline Sisters of Tildonk, U.S. Province; UUFHC (Unitarian Universalist Fellowship of Harford County); Vermont Citizens Action Network; Vermont Yankee Decommissioning Alliance; Veterans For Peace Golden Rule Project; Veterans For Peace Chapter 74; Western States Legal Foundation; West Valley Neighborhoods Coalition.

Women's Energy Matters; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Des Moines Branch; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Fresno Branch; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Monterey County Branch; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Pittsburgh Branch; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Santa Cruz Branch; Youth Arts New York.

MAY 8, 2018.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned organizations and businesses write to express our vehement opposition to H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which is scheduled to be considered by the House of Representatives this week.

By reviving licensing activities for Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste repository, this legislation has the potential to adversely impact citizens and businesses located in Nevada.

Yucca Mountain is located just 90 miles from the world's premier tourist, convention and entertainment destination in Las Vegas, Nevada, which welcomed nearly 43 million visitors last year. Las Vegas is once again on pace to meet or break that number with over

10 million visitors already accounted for in 2018. The Greater Las Vegas area is one of the fastest growing in the U.S. with a population that now exceeds 2.1 million people according to an estimate from the U.S. Census Bureau. Safety and security remain a top priority for all Americans and any problems with the transport of more than 110,000 metric tons of nuclear waste to the site throughout the country, or issues with its storage there, would bring potentially devastating consequences to the local, state and national communities. Moreover, with taxes on Nevada's tourism industry providing 42 percent of the state general fund, even a modest decline in visitors' perception about the region could have severe negative implications for the state's economy and future growth.

We stand with the many concerned citizens, small business operators and bipartisan members of the Nevada delegation in staunch opposition to any attempt to restart the repository licensing process and will work tirelessly to ensure that radioactive waste is never stored anywhere near the world's entertainment capital in Las Vegas.

We strongly urge members to vote against this flawed legislation and, instead, explore alternative solutions that respect state sovereignty and do not put Nevada's citizens and economy at risk.

Sincerely,

Geoff Freeman, President and CEO—American Gaming Association; Virginia Valentine, President—Nevada Resort Association; Mary Beth Sewald, President and CEO—Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce; Rossi Ralengkotter, CEO—Las Vegas Convention & Visitors Authority; James Murren, Chairman and CEO—MGM Resorts International; Joe Asher, CEO—William Hill U.S.; Keith Smith, President and CEO—Boyd Gaming Corporation; Mark P. Frissora, President and CEO—Caesars Entertainment; Sheldon Adelson, Chairman and CEO—Las Vegas Sands Corporation; Timothy J. Wilmott, CEO—Penn National Gaming.

UNITEHERE!,

New York, NY, May 8, 2018.

Oppose H.R. 3053, Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: UNITE HERE represents more workers in Nevada than any other union in the country. Our Nevada affiliate, Culinary Local 226, represents 60,000 workers who are the backbone to the tourism and hospitality industry of the Strip. The role of our union is to fight for what's best for these 60,000 workers and their families, and in the case of H.R. 3053 the best interest of our members is clearly to vote no and oppose all attempts to license a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain.

Turning Yucca Mountain into a nuclear dumping ground will put all 60,000 UNITE HERE members of Culinary 226 and their families at enormous risk, along with all 2.1 million people living in the Greater Las Vegas area. Yucca Mountain is dangerously close to where our members and their families live, as well as to the economic heartbeat of Nevada that keeps the economy afloat—only 90 miles from the Las Vegas Strip.

The continued health of our members and their families in Nevada is on stake with your vote on H.R. 3053. To keep 60,000 UNITE HERE workers safe in Nevada, we urge you to oppose H.R. 3053.

Sincerely,

D. TAYLOR,
International President.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, you have heard that the legislation before you

now, "Screw Nevada 2.0," is a work of compromise, a bipartisan effort, not perfect, but a step forward. Well, that, frankly, is an opinion. It is not the facts. Here are the facts:

The legislation overrides environmental laws, allowing the EPA to move the goalposts in terms of radiation limits to ensure that nothing will ever interfere with the agenda of the nuclear industry.

It sets up a consent-based process for the establishment of an interim storage facility but imposes a permanent facility at Yucca Mountain.

It increases the amount of nuclear waste to be dumped in Nevada by 37 percent, 110 metric tons more that were not considered in any of the environmental or safety studies being used to justify the project.

It also removes the prohibition currently in law that prohibits Nevada from being the de facto interim storage facility until a permanent one can be licensed.

It was also changed after passing out of committee to address the high scoring costs, making it less likely that we get host benefits.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, also, contrary to the sponsor's comments, the area around Yucca Mountain is not some desolate area. It has iconic wildlife, endangered species, and Native American artifacts.

Also, the proposed facility sits above the water table and on an active fault and can only be reached by roads that travel through 329 of your congressional districts.

Finally, like New Mexico, the people in Nevada have suffered from tests of atomic weapons that the government told us: Don't worry; it will be safe.

In short, this bill does nothing to really address the root of the problem, and I urge Members to vote against it.

It has cost us 36 years and \$15 billion, and all we have to show for it is a hole in the ground. We should be doing consent-based decisionmaking that will move us forward and not continue this failed policy that is bad politics and bad policy.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a subcommittee chair of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. SHIMKUS, for this important legislation.

This is a bipartisan piece of legislation that, it has already been said, puts our country back on the right track in honoring that commitment that was made by the Federal Government to safely collect and dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level nuclear waste.

It has been noted here this morning that, under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Congress assigned the re-

sponsibility for spent nuclear fuel to the Federal Government; but today, because the Federal Government has failed to honor this commitment, spent nuclear fuel sits idle in 121 communities across 39 States.

It was back in 1987 that Congress designated Yucca Mountain as the permanent repository for nuclear waste, but despite collecting more than \$40 billion from taxpayers, Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository has yet to be completed.

The legislation before us today offers important reforms for our country's nuclear waste policy. It utilizes Yucca Mountain as our main point of nuclear waste storage, while directing the Department of Energy to move forward with a temporary storage program as it works on the Yucca Mountain facility.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague again for his legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3053.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN).

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chair, today I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

Mr. Chair, I find it offensive. I sit here and listen to all my colleagues, and they all want to send nuclear waste to the State of Nevada. They are all generating this nuclear waste, and they want to send it to my backyard right in the Fourth Congressional District.

Bottom line is this, Mr. Chair: If you generate nuclear waste, you should keep it in your own backyard. Don't be sending it to our backyard.

I have met with various people out at Nellis Air Force Base and Creech Air Force Base and the Hawthorne Army Depot. These are very important military installations in the Fourth Congressional District for our entire country. They don't want this nuclear waste passing through their own backyard.

It is offensive. It is offensive that we have a State that depends on tourism, that depends on people coming into the State, and we want to bring all this nuclear waste to my backyard. We want to send it to Yucca Mountain, a place that hasn't even been deemed safe.

It is disappointing, Mr. Chair, that we have all this nuclear waste and we can't pick any other place in the country. It has to be somewhere where we have military bases. It has to be somewhere where it hasn't been deemed safe, where there is seismic activity. Just a few weeks ago, there was an earthquake there.

Mr. Chair, I am seriously concerned for Nevadans. I am seriously concerned for our military bases. I am concerned about our tourists who are going to be

coming from all over the country. I am concerned about every single one of the congressional districts and its constituents where this nuclear waste is going to be traveling through. These are some serious concerns that have been brought up that none of us, none of my colleagues have been able to address.

Mr. Chair, I am here to oppose this project. I am here to speak on behalf of 80 percent of Nevadans who oppose bringing nuclear waste to our backyard, and I am here to send a message that we are going to continue fighting this tooth and nail right here in Congress, in the Senate, here in the House, and, also, if need be, we are going to continue fighting this in the legal courts.

Mr. Chair, I am here to speak in opposition and to speak on behalf of all Nevadans.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS), who has been very helpful in this project.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018.

At the decommissioned San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station just south of my district, 1,800 tons of spent nuclear fuel sits along the Pacific coastline. This spent nuclear fuel must be moved for safety and environmental reasons, but also out of fairness to American taxpayers.

To date, California ratepayers have contributed more than \$2 billion to the Nuclear Waste Fund, with the promise those funds would help establish a permanent storage facility. H.R. 3053 authorizes interim storage, a necessary step to move spent nuclear fuel out of our communities and into interim storage facilities, until a permanent storage solution is established.

Mr. Chair, I speak on behalf of my constituents, who say the time to fix this problem is now. The Federal Government owes it to the American people to fulfill its obligation and take ownership of spent fuel.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3053.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today and stand with the overwhelming majority of Nevadans who wholeheartedly oppose our State becoming the dumping ground for the rest of the Nation's nuclear waste.

Based on the Department of Energy's own studies, Yucca Mountain is unfit as a repository site for nuclear waste because of the impact it would have on national transportation. We are talking about shipping up to three loads of radioactive waste per week to Nevada by rail or truck for over 50 years.

Here is a map of what the proposed routes would look like. Dangerous waste would go through 329 congressional districts across this country.

To the Members representing these districts: Do you consent to high-level radioactive waste barreling down your highways and your train tracks? Are you prepared to face your constituents at home and tell them that you voted to put their safety at risk?

Yucca Mountain would also jeopardize our national security and the readiness of our Air Force by compromising military activities at the Nevada Test and Training Range, the largest air and ground military training space in the contiguous United States.

Instead of spending billions more in hard-earned taxpayer dollars on this ill-conceived project, let's work on converting the site into something that will keep our families safe and still create jobs.

My bill, the Jobs, Not Waste Act, which I offered as an amendment to H.R. 3053, would prohibit DOE from moving forward with its plan until a number of other job-creating alternatives for Yucca Mountain are considered. It is an innovative and forward-thinking solution to repurpose this site for something useful.

Mr. Chair, I urge Congress to stop wasting time and taxpayer money on Yucca Mountain and finally realize just how dangerous and costly this project will be. It is past time we identified viable alternatives for this project while finding a safe, long-term repository in a State that consents to its siting.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, as a military pilot, Air Force pilot, I think it is important to note that this will not affect range operations at Nellis Air Force Base.

My district is home to four nuclear power plants, and I have seen firsthand the hard work and dedication of the men and women who work there. These plants not only provide clean, reliable power, but also create good jobs, and they strengthen our communities.

In 1982, the government made a commitment to these communities. Congress and the President approved Yucca Mountain over 15 years ago. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission concluded it can safely store spent fuel there for 1 million years.

In Illinois alone, ratepayers have contributed over \$3 billion to the Nuclear Waste Fund, and Illinois houses more spent fuel than any State.

Today is about following through on our commitments. We must reassure communities like La Salle and Byron, that put their trust in the government, that they can continue to make clean, reliable nuclear power as well as have a safe place to store it.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman and my Illinois colleague, JOHN SHIMKUS, for being a tireless advocate for making good on this commitment.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

Next to me is a picture of Haddam Neck, Connecticut, which is a pristine part of the State where the Connecticut River and the Salmon River come together. Where the circle is on the photograph, there are 43 casks of spent nuclear power uranium rods that, again, today, pretty much cordon off that whole area. If you drove up in a car, you would be met by a platoon of heavily armed security guards who, for good reason, have to patrol that area every single day because of the dangerous material that is stored there. That has been the case for over 20 years.

It costs Connecticut ratepayers \$10 million a year, again, for a site that should be long overdue for renovation and access to folks from all over the world because of its rich archeological and historical area.

This bill provides a way out for this area, along with 120 other sites across the country, where host communities have been saddled with storage of spent nuclear fuel because of the fact that this country has been unable to come together with a coherent policy. This bill provides a way out.

Mr. Chair, I congratulate the proponents on both sides of the aisle for getting us to that place.

Waterford, Connecticut, is also home to Dominion, a nuclear power plant with a similar situation that, again, is long overdue for change.

I also just want to note, as the Representative from Groton, Connecticut, the home of the nuclear Navy—it was where the *Nautilus* was first launched in 1956—we have, as a country, been transporting spent nuclear fuel for aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines for decades by land and by sea safely and efficiently, and the notion that we can't do this for our civilian nuclear power facilities is, frankly, just demonstrably untrue.

□ 1000

We can do this, and this bill provides, as I say, a mechanism for an interim storage that is sensible, that is logical, and is bipartisan. Again, I congratulate the proponents and strongly urge a "yes" vote on this measure later this morning.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this vital issue.

The Federal Government asked Americans to pay roughly \$40 billion in taxes and interest with the promise the government would operate a national

repository. Thirty-seven years later, no repository, and my district is hampered with the burden of maintaining 40 spent fuel casks, with more on the way.

Now, while on-site storage is done in a very safe and highly secure manner, it is simply not appropriate. In fact, in 1991, the United States Department of the Interior agreed, stating: "The imposition of risk upon the Prairie Island Indian community is an unreasonable burden."

Prairie Island is just one community shouldering this burden. The city of Red Wing and the citizens of Goodhue County expect better.

In fact, my constituents reminded me that, by law, the repository should have been open in 1998, stating: But it is not our responsibility to remind Congress to do its job. They are right.

I urge my colleagues to uphold our promise and vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4053, and I thank Chairman SHIMKUS for the great leadership he has provided on this bill on this really significant issue.

This bill authorizes the construction of Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste storage site, which would alleviate the burden of incredible risk that is now borne by communities throughout the country, such as in my district, where homes are not far located from the closed San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station.

That, and many other plants throughout the Nation, have closed their doors in decades. Yet, Congress has yet to agree how to safely store that waste, and what is really important is we must store the waste.

But while we develop new nuclear energy technologies, that we are capable of doing, that are safe, and produce less of their own waste, and can consume the waste of older plants, I reminded Secretary of Energy Perry of that yesterday; but, in the meantime, until that technology—by the way, it is sinful that we have not developed that technology, which we are capable of, that could eat this waste.

But until we do, having safe storage at Yucca Mountain makes all the sense to me and is safe for my constituents.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I understand the importance of enacting critical reforms to our nuclear waste management strategy, reforms that are long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I have the great honor of representing Georgia's 12th Congressional District, which is home to every nuclear reactor in our State, and we are leading the way in the new nuclear.

At Plant Vogtle, in my district, there are thousands of spent fuel rods being held in spent fuel pools and dry cask storage containers, and in the next few years we are going to double the number of nuclear reactors online at Vogtle.

H.R. 3053 would help pave the way to quickly establish a permanent geological repository to dispose of the waste that currently sits in 121 communities across America, including those in Georgia-12. This process has gone on far too long, and now it is time for Congress to act and pass this common-sense legislation.

I want to thank Subcommittee Chair SHIMKUS for his work and diligence on this matter, and I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting "yes" for this bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, our ranking member, for allowing me to speak.

I rise in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. Congress, back in 1982, passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, directing the Department of Energy and Nuclear Regulatory Commission to open a permanent repository for our Nation's spent nuclear fuel. Now, Congress is slow, but this is amazing how we haven't dealt with this.

Over three decades later, America is still without a repository, leaving tens of thousands of tons of nuclear waste vulnerable to acts of terror or other catastrophes.

If you say you are for all-of-the-above for power generation, then you need to vote for this bill, because if we are really going to use nuclear power, which we get about 20 percent in Texas, we need a place to put that waste, and not just on the sites where we produce it.

There was a decision made in the 1980s it would be out in Yucca Mountain, and that wasn't our decision, but that is there, and it is Federal property. That is where we exploded atomic bombs during the testing. Nobody is going to build condos on that property, because I was out there with the chairman of the committee.

Until the day we find interim storage to ensure 70,000 tons of spent fuel sitting in our Nation's nuclear plants are safe from harm at an interim storage facility, there is one proposed in west Texas that the folks out there want it.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill so we can finally move the ball forward on safely storing our Nation's spent nuclear fuel.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise too, in support of this bill, and I want to single out Chairman SHIMKUS for his tireless work. He stood up in conference after conference after conference, insisting that we move forward. This bill has been, indeed, a long time coming.

This is about a national solution to a national problem. Each of the States could come up with their own navies, their own armies. We tried that once in South Carolina. It didn't work out so well.

But it is important that we, again, have a national solution to a national issue; that is certainly the case with nuclear waste. This is about moving past politics to policy. This thing has been held up for years based on politics.

I don't begrudge anybody in Nevada for pushing and using every tool in the toolkit in holding it off, but this is ultimately moving to policy.

This is about not building a mountain of waste in South Carolina and a whole lot of other interim sites across this country. We have a fault line at the Savannah River Site, and there are similar security concerns with the plethora of different sites that we have across this country. Consolidating makes sense from a security standpoint.

Finally, this is about giving people what they paid for, \$40 billion nationally, over \$1 billion in South Carolina paid by ratepayers.

I thank the chairman for acting on this bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL).

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Illinois, Representative SHIMKUS, for his steadfast leadership on this very important issue.

I rise today, as well, to lend my support to H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018.

Mr. Chairman, America lacks the necessary geological repository for important nuclear power resources. Because of this, spent nuclear fuel currently sits idle in over 100 communities across 39 States. This deficiency has cost electricity ratepayers over \$40 billion with little to nothing to show for the exorbitant cost.

H.R. 3053 makes long overdue reforms to the Nuclear Waste Fund and facilitates the formal licensing process for the repository at Yucca Mountain. It provides a commonsense, bipartisan interim solution for the safe storage of nuclear waste.

Most importantly, H.R. 3053 ensures that this safe, efficient form of energy can continue to expand and be utilized in the United States, such as Georgia's Plant Vogtle.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3053 is much-needed legislation that will finally ensure the safe disposal of nuclear waste

in this country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I can't think of a more unrewarding, difficult, fruitless issue to be asked to be the leader on than trying to find a solution to high-level nuclear waste. Can you imagine if, when you get elected to Congress, you are called into the Speaker's office or the minority leader's office and said: Now, I know you are young and bright and everything, but we want you to take the lead on something that we haven't been able to solve in 30 years.

Well, that is what JOHN SHIMKUS and Congressman TONKO have been tasked to do. There is not a more unpleasant issue in the 30-something years I have been in the House than this issue.

Having said that, it is probably one of the most important issues to solve. We have, at one time, over 100 operating nuclear reactors. They generate electricity every day, and they use and eventually consume their nuclear fuel rods. And when they have been used up, you can't put them on the curb and tell the trash to pick them up.

Now, Mr. TONKO and Mr. SHIMKUS have worked, not just this Congress, but the last Congress, and in the case of JOHN SHIMKUS, probably the last six Congresses, seven Congresses, to try to solve this.

We have a bipartisan bill today. I predict it is going to get in the neighborhood of 260 to maybe 300 votes. It solves the problem. And the key, in my opinion, to what they have done is that they have allowed for an interim storage facility in a State that approves it beforehand.

You are going to have States compete to accept this high-level nuclear waste on an interim basis, and you make a path forward to finish the licensing process, or make a negative determination in Nevada at Yucca Mountain.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BARTON. You are going to have a way to begin, if this bill becomes law, to get the waste that is now stored on-site at deactivated, in some cases, nuclear power plants, consolidated to interim storage, make a decision on Yucca, "yea" or "nay," and if it is "yea" then begin that process.

This is a very good effort. It should pass the House, it should pass the Senate, and the President should sign it. And then we will finally, after almost 40 years, begin to solve high-level nuclear waste issues in America.

I thank both the leaders on this bill, and I hope we get a "yes" vote.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am not closing yet. We are waiting for the majority whip.

Mr. Chairman, I want to highlight a couple of issues, of course, that have been raised. In my brief opening statement I reminded the folks—and I see my colleague from Chicagoland on the floor—Chicago gets 55 million visitors a year. In Chicagoland there are 10,000 metric tons. That is in the community, that is where there are condos, and it is right there.

This proposed long-term repository is 90 miles away from Las Vegas. It is a mountain in a desert. If it gets approved, final adjudication.

And what has held up the final adjudication? Politics on the appropriation matter, which I think this bill is going to help solve, because once we get a good vote—my colleagues, I don't think we voted on an authorization bill, on this issue on an authorization bill, since 2002.

□ 1015

That is when the State of Nevada objected, per the law. They were allowed to do that. We had a chance, then, to override that veto. Because, as MARK SANFORD said, this is a national problem that demands a national solution.

So the law laid out an opportunity to hear the complaints from the State of Nevada and say "yes" or "no." They said "no."

The law laid out the opportunity for the national legislative body and the President of the United States to decide to accept or reject that.

I think this Chamber vote was about 350 to reject the State of Nevada's opposition. The Senate rejected it on a voice vote.

So we have been through this numerous times. We know where the majority of Representatives are, and we know where the majority of Senators will be. We have just got to move. We have got to address this national problem with a national solution.

Another issue that was just touched on by Chairman WALDEN, he spent a lot of time on it, is spent nuclear fuel. This is ratepayers also helping pay for our defense waste obligations. The nuclear weapons and winning the Cold War created stockpiles of nuclear waste, toxic sludge, in areas in four States primarily. Primarily, Washington State, also South Carolina. Ratepayers are going to help safely dispose of that.

So when you take the national defense problem and the spent nuclear fuel problem, we are moving forward in that direction.

Nevadans are not uniformly opposed to the repository. In fact, nine of the surrounding counties have passed resolutions to move forward, at least with the adjudication.

And as my colleagues from Nevada know, I have been to that State quite a few times, and we talked to many, many people on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, it is very rare that we consider a perfect bill. This is not the bill Mr. PALLONE or I would have written on our own, and I do not think it is a bill Mr. SHIMKUS would have wanted on his own either, but that is the nature of compromise.

I again want to thank Mr. SHIMKUS and his staff for their willingness to work with us to address a number of our concerns with the initial bill.

And I want to acknowledge the hard work done by Tuley Wright, Rick Kessler, and other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee minority staff, who worked so diligently on this legislation.

I truly understand the concerns raised by my colleagues in opposition, especially those from the Nevada delegation, and I sympathize with many of their arguments, but the reality is our Nation has a substantial amount of nuclear waste, and we as a Nation need a plan to address it.

We are dealing with the constraints of legislation passed some 30 years ago, and within those constraints, I believe this bill is a step in the right direction to address our Nation's nuclear waste issues.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to also thank the staff on both sides for their work. This is the way legislation is supposed to move. You have hearings. In Energy and Commerce, we really have four: a subcommittee hearing markup, subcommittee markup, full committee markup, then we go through the process. So our staff has done a tremendous job.

I also want to thank Ranking Member PALLONE and Ranking Member TONKO for their friendship and their actually good negotiating skills. As they have told me many times, they have changed this bill through their diligence, and that has got us here to a better product.

I will end up on three quick points. We have raised them before.

We can transport this safely. We have done it for decades.

Every day, taxpayers are paying from all 50 States into the Judgment Fund because of our failure to meet our legal obligations. I think it is almost \$800 million a year that we pay because we are breaking the law.

Independent scientific analysis of the Yucca Mountain repository found the site can safely dispose of nuclear waste for 1 million years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, today, my colleagues and I will vote on H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. H.R. 3053 provides practical reforms to ensure that the federal government fulfills its legal obligation to dispose of nuclear waste currently present in 121 communities across 39 states. The federal government is 20 years behind in implementing this disposal program. As a result, current litigation costs have totaled more than \$6 billion—mounting to nearly \$800 million a year and approximately \$34 billion in future liabilities. I am proud to support this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3053.

H.R. 3053 reforms the program's broken financing mechanism. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 established the Nuclear Waste Fund financed through the collection of fee receipts paid by nuclear utilities and ratepayers. However, under current scorekeeping, these receipts are credited as offsetting mandatory receipts rather than discretionary appropriations in the federal budget. Consequently, the program cannot be adequately funded because the collected fees are not credited toward discretionary appropriations for future program expenditures.

Addressing the budgetary classification of these fees prior to the Department of Energy resuming their collection is a top priority. In order for this program to operate as intended, the collection of these fees must be classified as discretionary spending. H.R. 3053 accomplishes this by offsetting future spending for nuclear waste management as discretionary spending and ensuring long-term funding for the program. The circumstances of the Nuclear Waste Fund are unique due to the delay in implementation of the program and the resulting litigation. As a result, both the fee collections and the program's subsequent spending need equivalent budgetary classifications.

The scorekeeping treatment in the bill should not be viewed as a precedent for future legislative activity in other, unrelated programs.

We are 20 years behind fulfilling this program's promise. We owe it to the taxpayer, ratepayer, and nuclear industry to pass H.R. 3053 and uphold our legal and contractual obligations to collect nuclear waste. I support the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018 and urge its passage.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 115-69. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3053

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MONITORED RETRIEVABLE STORAGE

Sec. 101. Monitored retrievable storage.

Sec. 102. Authorization and priority.

Sec. 103. Conditions for MRS agreements.

Sec. 104. Survey.

Sec. 105. Site selection.

Sec. 106. Benefits agreement.

Sec. 107. Licensing.

Sec. 108. Financial assistance.

TITLE II—PERMANENT REPOSITORY

Sec. 201. Land withdrawal, jurisdiction, and reservation.

Sec. 202. Application procedures and infrastructure activities.

Sec. 203. Pending repository license application.

Sec. 204. Limitation on planning, development, or construction of defense waste repository.

Sec. 205. Sense of Congress regarding transportation routes.

TITLE III—DOE CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

Sec. 301. Title to material.

TITLE IV—BENEFITS TO HOST COMMUNITY

Sec. 401. Consent.

Sec. 402. Content of agreements.

Sec. 403. Covered units of local government.

Sec. 404. Termination.

Sec. 405. Priority funding for certain institutions of higher education.

Sec. 406. Disposal of spent nuclear fuel.

Sec. 407. Updated report.

TITLE V—FUNDING

Sec. 501. Assessment and collection of fees.

Sec. 502. Use of Waste Fund.

Sec. 503. Annual multiyear budget proposal.

Sec. 504. Availability of certain amounts.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Certain standards and criteria.

Sec. 602. Application.

Sec. 603. Transportation safety assistance.

Sec. 604. Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.

Sec. 605. West Lake Landfill.

Sec. 606. Subseabed or ocean water disposal.

Sec. 607. Sense of Congress regarding storage of nuclear waste near the Great Lakes.

Sec. 608. Budgetary effects.

TITLE I—MONITORED RETRIEVABLE STORAGE

SEC. 101. MONITORED RETRIEVABLE STORAGE.

(a) **PROPOSAL.**—Section 141(b) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10161(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “1985” and inserting “2019”; and

(B) by striking “the construction of”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) designs, specifications, and cost estimates sufficient to—

“(i) solicit bids for the construction of one or more such facilities; and

“(ii) enable completion and operation of such a facility as soon as practicable;”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “this Act.” and inserting “this Act; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) options to enter into MRS agreements with respect to one or more monitored retrievable storage facilities.”; and

(3) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) The Secretary shall, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018, publish a request for information to help the Secretary

evaluate options for the Secretary to enter into MRS agreements with respect to one or more monitored retrievable storage facilities.”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 141 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10161) is further amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(2)—

(i) by striking “If the Congress” and all that follows through “monitored retrievable storage facility, the” and inserting “The”; and

(ii) by striking “construction of such facility” and inserting “construction of a monitored retrievable storage facility”; and

(B) by striking subsections (d) through (h).

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (34), by striking “the storage facility” and inserting “a storage facility”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(35) The term ‘MRS agreement’ means a cooperative agreement, contract, or other mechanism that the Secretary considers appropriate to support the storage of Department-owned civilian waste in one or more monitored retrievable storage facilities as authorized under section 142(b)(2).

“(36) The term ‘Department-owned civilian waste’ means high-level radioactive waste, or spent nuclear fuel, resulting from civilian nuclear activities, to which the Department holds title.”.

(3) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—Section 146 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10166) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “such subsection” and inserting “subsection (f) of such section”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “this subsection” and inserting “this section”.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION AND PRIORITY.

Section 142 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10162) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Subject to the requirements of this subtitle, the Secretary is authorized to—

“(1) site, construct, and operate one or more monitored retrievable storage facilities; and

“(2) store, pursuant to an MRS agreement, Department-owned civilian waste at a monitored retrievable storage facility for which a non-Federal entity holds a license described in section 143(1).

“(c) **PRIORITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall prioritize storage of Department-owned civilian waste at a monitored retrievable storage facility authorized under subsection (b)(2).

“(2) **EXCEPTION.**—

“(A) **DETERMINATION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the Secretary determines that it will be faster and less expensive to site, construct, and operate a facility authorized under subsection (b)(1), in comparison to a facility authorized under subsection (b)(2).

“(B) **NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days after the Secretary makes a determination described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to Congress written notification of such determination.”.

SEC. 103. CONDITIONS FOR MRS AGREEMENTS.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 143 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10163) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 143. CONDITIONS FOR MRS AGREEMENTS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may not enter into an MRS agreement under section 142(b)(2) unless—

“(1) the monitored retrievable storage facility with respect to which the MRS agreement applies has been licensed by the Commission under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

“(2) the non-Federal entity that is a party to the MRS agreement has approval to store Department-owned civilian waste at such facility from each of—

“(A) the Governor of the State in which the facility is located;

“(B) any unit of general local government with jurisdiction over the area in which the facility is located; and

“(C) any affected Indian tribe;

“(3) except as provided in subsection (b), the Commission has issued a final repository decision; and

“(4) the MRS agreement provides that the quantity of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel at the site of the facility at any one time will not exceed the limits described in section 148(d)(3) and (4).

“(b) INITIAL AGREEMENT.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may enter into one MRS agreement under section 142(b)(2) before the Commission has issued a final repository decision.

“(2) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

“(A) for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2022, the greater of—

“(i) \$50,000,000; or

“(ii) the amount that is equal to 10 percent of the amounts appropriated from the Waste Fund in that fiscal year; and

“(B) for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2025, the amount that is equal to 10 percent of the amounts appropriated from the Waste Fund in that fiscal year.

“(3) PRIORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An MRS agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall, to the extent allowable under this Act (including under the terms of the standard contract established in section 961.11 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations), provide for prioritization of the storage of Department-owned civilian waste that originated from facilities that have ceased commercial operation.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON STANDARD CONTRACT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to amend or otherwise alter the standard contract established in section 961.11 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(4) CONDITIONS.—

“(A) NO STORAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may not store any Department-owned civilian waste at the initial MRS facility until the Commission has issued a final repository decision.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—

“(i) FINDING.—The Secretary may make a finding that a final repository decision is imminent, which finding shall be updated not less often than quarterly until the date on which the Commission issues a final repository decision.

“(ii) STORAGE.—If the Secretary makes a finding under clause (i), the Secretary may store Department-owned civilian waste at the initial MRS facility in accordance with this section.

“(iii) NOTICE.—Not later than seven days after the Secretary makes or updates a finding under clause (i), the Secretary shall submit to Congress written notification of such finding.

“(iv) REPORTING.—In addition to the requirements of section 114(c), if the Secretary makes a finding under clause (i), the Secretary shall submit to Congress the report described in such section 114(c) not later than 1 month after the Secretary makes such finding and monthly thereafter until the date on which the Commission issues a final repository decision.

“(C) NO EFFECT ON FEDERAL DISPOSAL POLICY.—Nothing in this subsection affects the Federal responsibility for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, or the definite Federal policy with regard to the disposal of such waste and spent fuel, established under subtitle A, as described in section 111(b).

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1) FINAL REPOSITORY DECISION.—The term ‘final repository decision’ means a final decision approving or disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1).

“(2) INITIAL MRS FACILITY.—The term ‘initial MRS facility’ means the monitored retrievable storage facility with respect to which an MRS agreement is entered into pursuant to subsection (b)(1).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 143 in the table of contents for the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 143. Conditions for MRS agreements.”.

SEC. 104. SURVEY.

Section 144 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10164) is amended—

(1) by striking “After the MRS Commission submits its report to the Congress under section 143, the” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—The”;

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “for a monitored retrievable storage facility” and inserting “for any monitored retrievable storage facility authorized under section 142”;

(3) in paragraph (6), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(4) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(5) by adding after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) be acceptable to State authorities, affected units of local government, and affected Indian tribes.

“(b) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.—The Secretary shall issue a request for proposals for an MRS agreement authorized under section 142(b)(2) before conducting a survey and evaluation under subsection (a), and shall consider any proposals received in response to such request in making the evaluation.”.

SEC. 105. SITE SELECTION.

Section 145 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10165) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “select the site evaluated” and inserting “select a site evaluated”;

(B) by striking “the most”; and

(C) by inserting “authorized under section 142(b)(1)” after “monitored retrievable storage facility”; and

(2) by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 106. BENEFITS AGREEMENT.

Section 147 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10167) is amended—

(1) by inserting “the Secretary intends to construct and operate under section 142(b)(1)” after “storage facility”; and

(2) by inserting “or once a non-Federal entity enters into an MRS agreement under section 142(b)(2),” after “section 145.”.

SEC. 107. LICENSING.

(a) REVIEW OF LICENSE APPLICATION.—Section 148(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10168(c)) is amended by striking “section 142(b)” and inserting “section 142(b)(1)”.

(b) LICENSING CONDITIONS.—Section 148(d) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10168(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “has issued a license for the construction of a repository under section 115(d)” and inserting “has issued a final decision approving or disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1)”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “or construction of the repository ceases”.

SEC. 108. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 149 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 is amended by inserting “authorized under section 142(b)(1)” after “a monitored retrievable storage facility”.

TITLE II—PERMANENT REPOSITORY

SEC. 201. LAND WITHDRAWAL, JURISDICTION, AND RESERVATION.

(a) LAND WITHDRAWAL, JURISDICTION, AND RESERVATION.—

(1) LAND WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as provided otherwise in

this section, the lands described in subsection (c) are withdrawn permanently from all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws, including the mineral leasing laws, the geothermal leasing laws, and the mining laws.

(2) JURISDICTION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, jurisdiction over the withdrawal is vested in the Secretary. There are transferred to the Secretary the lands within the withdrawal under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned on the effective date described in subsection (j)(1).

(3) RESERVATION.—The withdrawal is reserved for use by the Secretary for development, preconstruction testing and performance confirmation, licensing, construction, management and operation, monitoring, closure, postclosure, and other activities associated with the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.).

(b) REVOCATION AND MODIFICATION OF PUBLIC LAND ORDERS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—

(1) PUBLIC LAND ORDER REVOCATION.—Public Land Order 6802 of September 25, 1990, as extended by Public Land Order 7534, and any conditions or memoranda of understanding accompanying those land orders, are revoked.

(2) RIGHT-OF-WAY RESERVATIONS.—Project right-of-way reservations N-48602 and N-47748 of January 2001, are revoked.

(c) LAND DESCRIPTION.—

(1) BOUNDARIES.—The lands and interests in lands withdrawn and reserved by this section comprise the approximately 147,000 acres of land in Nye County, Nevada, as generally depicted on the Yucca Mountain Project Map, YMP-03-024.2, entitled “Proposed Land Withdrawal” and dated July 21, 2005.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(A) publish in the Federal Register a notice containing a legal description of the withdrawal; and

(B) file copies of the maps described in paragraph (1) and the legal description of the withdrawal with the Congress, the Governor of the State of Nevada, and the Archivist of the United States.

(3) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—The maps and legal description referred to in this subsection have the same force and effect as if they were included in this section. The Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in the maps and legal description.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER RESERVATIONS.—The provisions of subtitle A of title XXX of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (sections 3011–3023 of Public Law 106–65) and of Public Land Order 2568 do not apply to the lands withdrawn and reserved for use by the Secretary under subsection (a). This Act does not apply to any other lands withdrawn for use by the Department of Defense under subtitle A of title XXX of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999.

(e) MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall manage the lands withdrawn by subsection (a) consistent with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), this section, and other applicable law. The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary concerned in discharging that responsibility.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary, after consulting with the Secretary concerned, shall develop a management plan for the use of the withdrawal. Within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit the management plan to the Congress and the State of Nevada.

(B) PRIORITY OF YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT-RELATED ISSUES.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), any use of the withdrawal for activities not associated with the Project is subject to

conditions and restrictions that the Secretary considers necessary or desirable to permit the conduct of Project-related activities.

(C) **DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE USES.**—The management plan may provide for the continued use by the Department of the Air Force of the portion of the withdrawal within the Nellis Air Force Base Test and Training Range under terms and conditions on which the Secretary and the Secretary of the Air Force agree concerning Air Force activities.

(D) **OTHER NON-YUCCA-MOUNTAIN-PROJECT USES.**—The management plan shall provide for the maintenance of wildlife habitat and shall provide that the Secretary may permit non-Project-related uses that the Secretary considers appropriate, including domestic livestock grazing and hunting and trapping in accordance with the following requirements:

(i) **GRAZING.**—The Secretary may permit grazing to continue where established before the effective date described in subsection (j)(1), subject to regulations, policies, and practices that the Secretary, after consulting with the Secretary of the Interior, determines to be necessary or appropriate. The management of grazing shall be conducted in accordance with applicable grazing laws and policies, including—

(I) the Act commonly known as the “Taylor Grazing Act” (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.);

(II) title IV of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.); and

(III) the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.).

(ii) **HUNTING AND TRAPPING.**—The Secretary may permit hunting and trapping within the withdrawal where established before the effective date described in subsection (k)(1), except that the Secretary, after consulting with the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Nevada, may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or trapping is permitted for reasons of public safety, national security, administration, or public use and enjoyment.

(E) **MINING.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), surface or subsurface mining or oil or gas production, including slant drilling from outside the boundaries of the withdrawal, is not permitted at any time on lands on or under the withdrawal. The Secretary of the Interior shall evaluate and adjudicate the validity of all unpatented mining claims on the portion of the withdrawal that, on the date of enactment of this Act, was under the control of the Bureau of Land Management. The Secretary shall provide just compensation for the acquisition of any valid property right.

(ii) **CIND-R-LITE MINE.**—Patented Mining Claim No. 27-83-0002, covering the Cind-R-Lite Mine, shall not be affected by establishment of the withdrawal set forth in subsection (a)(1). In that event, the Secretary shall provide just compensation.

(F) **LIMITED PUBLIC ACCESS.**—The management plan may provide for limited public access to the portion of the withdrawal under Bureau of Land Management control on the effective date described in subsection (j)(1). Permitted uses may include continuation of the Nye County Early Warning Drilling Program, utility corridors, and other uses the Secretary, after consulting with the Secretary of the Interior, considers consistent with the purposes of the withdrawal.

(3) **CLOSURE.**—If the Secretary, after consulting with the Secretary concerned, determines that the health and safety of the public or the common defense and security require the closure of a road, trail, or other portion of the withdrawal, or the airspace above the withdrawal, the Secretary may effect and maintain the closure and shall provide notice of the closure.

(4) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Secretary and the Secretary concerned shall implement the man-

agement plan developed under paragraph (2) under terms and conditions on which they agree.

(f) **IMMUNITY.**—The United States and its departments and agencies shall be held harmless and shall not be liable for damages to persons or property suffered in the course of any mining, mineral leasing, or geothermal leasing activity conducted on the withdrawal.

(g) **LAND ACQUISITION.**—The Secretary may acquire lands and interests in lands within the withdrawal. Those lands and interests in lands may be acquired by donation, purchase, lease, exchange, easement, rights-of-way, or other appropriate methods using donated or appropriated funds. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct any exchange of lands within the withdrawal for Federal lands outside the withdrawal.

(h) **MATERIAL REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal, State, Interstate, or local requirement, either substantive or procedural, that is referred to in section 6001(a) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6961(a)) applies with respect to any material—

(1) as such material is transported to a repository for disposal at such repository; or

(2) as, or after, such material is disposed of in a repository.

(i) **DEFINITIONS.**—

(1) **NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1982 DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the terms “disposal”, “high-level radioactive waste”, “repository”, “Secretary”, and “spent nuclear fuel” have the meaning given those terms in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

(2) **OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(A) the term “withdrawal” means the geographic area consisting of the land described in subsection (c);

(B) the term “Secretary concerned” means the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary of the Interior, or both, as appropriate; and

(C) the term “Project” means the Yucca Mountain Project.

(j) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall take effect on the date on which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission issues a final decision approving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10134(d)) (as so designated by this Act).

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Subsections (c), (e)(2)(A), (h), (i), and (j) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. APPLICATION PROCEDURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES.

(a) **STATUS REPORT ON APPLICATION.**—Section 114(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10134(c)) is amended by striking “the date on which such authorization is granted” and inserting “the date on which the Commission issues a final decision approving or disapproving such application”.

(b) **APPLICATION PROCEDURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES.**—Section 114(d) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10134(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Commission shall consider” and inserting the following:

“(1) **APPLICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION.**—The Commission shall consider”;

(2) by striking “the expiration of 3 years after the date of the submission of such application” and inserting “30 months after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018”;

(3) by striking “70,000 metric tons” each place it appears and inserting “110,000 metric tons”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) **APPLICATIONS TO AMEND.**—If the Commission issues a construction authorization for a

repository pursuant to paragraph (1) and the Secretary submits an application to amend such authorization, the Commission shall consider the application to amend using expedited, informal procedures, including discovery procedures that minimize the burden on the parties to produce documents. The Commission shall issue a final decision on such application to amend within 1 year after the date of submission of such application, except that the Commission may extend such deadline by not more than 6 months if, not less than 30 days before such deadline, the Commission complies with the reporting requirements established in subsection (e)(2).

“(3) **INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—At any time before or after the Commission issues a final decision approving or disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may undertake infrastructure activities that the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to support construction or operation of a repository at the Yucca Mountain site or transportation to such site of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. Infrastructure activities include safety upgrades, site preparation, the construction of a rail line to connect the Yucca Mountain site with the national rail network (including any facilities to facilitate rail operations), and construction, upgrade, acquisition, or operation of electrical grids or facilities, other utilities, communication facilities, access roads, and nonnuclear support facilities.

“(B) **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.**—If the Secretary determines that an environmental analysis is required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to an infrastructure activity undertaken under this paragraph, the Secretary need not consider alternative actions or a no-action alternative. To the extent any other Federal agency must consider the potential environmental impact of such an infrastructure activity, the agency shall adopt, to the extent practicable, any environmental analysis prepared by the Secretary under this subparagraph without further action. Such adoption satisfies the responsibilities of the adopting agency under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and no further action is required by the agency.

“(C) **NO GROUNDS FOR DISAPPROVAL.**—The Commission may not disapprove, on the grounds that the Secretary undertook an infrastructure activity under this paragraph—

“(i) the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository pursuant to paragraph (1);

“(ii) a license to receive and possess spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; or

“(iii) any other action concerning the repository.”.

(c) **CONNECTED ACTIONS.**—Section 114(f)(6) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10134(f)(6)) is amended by striking “or nongeologic alternatives to such site” and inserting “nongeologic alternatives to such site, or an action connected or otherwise related to the repository to the extent the action is undertaken outside the geologic repository operations area and does not require a license from the Commission”.

SEC. 203. PENDING REPOSITORY LICENSE APPLICATION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to require the Secretary to amend or otherwise modify an application for a construction authorization described in section 114(d) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10134(d)) pending as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. LIMITATION ON PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, OR CONSTRUCTION OF DEFENSE WASTE REPOSITORY.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary of Energy may not take any action relating to the planning, development, or construction of a defense waste repository until the date on which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission issues a final

decision approving or disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10134(d)) (as so designated by this Act).

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the terms “atomic energy defense activity”, “high-level radioactive waste”, “repository”, and “spent nuclear fuel” have the meanings given those terms in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101); and

(2) the term “defense waste repository” means the repository for high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel derived from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy, as described in the draft plan of the Department titled “Draft Plan for a Defense Waste Repository” published on December 16, 2016.

SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ROUTES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Energy should consider routes for the transportation of spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste transported by or for the Secretary under subtitle A of title I of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10131 et seq.)

to the Yucca Mountain site that, to the extent practicable, avoid Las Vegas, Nevada.

TITLE III—DOE CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

SEC. 301. TITLE TO MATERIAL.

Section 123 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10143) is amended—

(1) by striking “Delivery” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Delivery”;

(2) by striking “repository constructed under this subtitle” and inserting “repository or monitored retrievable storage facility”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **CONTRACT MODIFICATION.**—The Secretary may enter into new contracts or negotiate modifications to existing contracts, with any person who generates or holds title to high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel of domestic origin, for acceptance of title, subsequent transportation, and storage of such high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel (including to expedite such acceptance of title, transportation, and storage of such waste or fuel from facilities that have ceased commercial operation) at a monitored retrievable storage facility authorized under subtitle C.”.

“BENEFITS SCHEDULE

Event	MRS	Repository
(A) Annual payments prior to first spent fuel receipt	\$5,000,000	\$15,000,000
(B) Upon first spent fuel receipt	\$10,000,000	\$400,000,000
(C) Annual payments after first spent fuel receipt until closure of the facility	\$10,000,000	\$40,000,000”.

(b) **RESTRICTIONS ON USE.**—Section 171(a) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “paragraph (7)” and inserting “paragraphs (7) and (8)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) None of the payments under this section may be used—

“(A) directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for any lobbying activity as provided in section 1913 of title 18, United States Code;

“(B) for litigation purposes; or

“(C) to support multistate efforts or other coalition-building activities inconsistent with the siting, construction, or operation of the monitored retrievable storage facility or repository concerned.”.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—Section 171(b) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173a(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection), by striking “in the design of the repository or monitored retrievable storage facility and”.

(d) **PAYMENTS BY SECRETARY.**—Section 171(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173a(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **PAYMENTS BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall make payments to the State of Nevada under a benefits agreement concerning a repository under section 170 from the Waste Fund. The signature of the Secretary on a valid benefits agreement under this subtitle shall constitute a commitment, but only to the extent that all amounts for that purpose are provided in advance in subsequent appropriations Acts, by the Secretary to make payments in accordance with such agreement.”.

SEC. 403. COVERED UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 172 the following new section:

“SEC. 172A. COVERED UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

“(a) **BENEFITS AGREEMENT.**—Not earlier than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary may enter into a benefits agreement with any covered unit of local government concerning a repository for the acceptance of high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel in the State of Nevada.

“(b) **CONTENT OF AGREEMENTS.**—In addition to any benefits that a covered unit of local government may receive under this Act, the Secretary shall make payments to such covered unit of local government that is a party to a benefits agreement under subsection (a) to mitigate impacts described in section 175(b).

“(c) **PAYMENTS FROM WASTE FUND.**—The Secretary shall make payments to a covered unit of local government under a benefits agreement under this section from the Waste Fund.

“(d) **RESTRICTION ON USE.**—None of the payments made pursuant to a benefits agreement under this section may be used—

“(1) directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for any lobbying activity as provided in section 1913 of title 18, United States Code;

“(2) for litigation purposes; or

“(3) to support multistate efforts or other coalition-building activities inconsistent with the siting, construction, or operation of the repository.”.

“(e) **CONSENT.**—The acceptance or use of any of the benefits provided under a benefits agreement under this section by any covered unit of local government shall not be considered to be an expression of consent, express or implied, to the siting of a repository in the State of Nevada.

“(f) **COVERED UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘covered unit of local government’ means—

TITLE IV—BENEFITS TO HOST COMMUNITY

SEC. 401. CONSENT.

Section 170 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “shall offer” and inserting “may offer”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting a comma after “repository”; and

(B) by inserting “per State,” after “facility”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) **CONSENT.**—The acceptance or use of any of the benefits provided under a benefits agreement under this section by the State of Nevada shall not be considered to be an expression of consent, express or implied, to the siting of a repository in such State.”.

SEC. 402. CONTENT OF AGREEMENTS.

(a) **BENEFITS SCHEDULE.**—The table in section 171(a)(1) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173a(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) any affected unit of local government with respect to a repository; and

“(2) any unit of general local government in the State of Nevada.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **BENEFITS AGREEMENT.**—Section 170(a)(4) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173(a)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) Benefits and payments under this subtitle made available pursuant to a benefits agreement under this section or section 172A may be made available only in accordance with such benefits agreement and to the extent that all amounts for that purpose are provided in advance in subsequent appropriations Acts.”.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—Section 170(e) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173(e)) is further amended by inserting “under this section” after “may be in effect”.

(3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 172, the following:

“Sec. 172A. Covered units of local government.”.

SEC. 404. TERMINATION.

Section 173 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10173c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “under this title if” and inserting “under this title”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “concerning a repository or a monitored retrievable storage facility, if” before “the site under consideration”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “the Secretary determines that the Commission cannot license the facility within a reasonable time” and inserting “concerning a repository, if the Commission issues a final decision disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1)”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) **TERMINATION BY STATE OR INDIAN TRIBE.**—A State, covered unit of local government (as defined in section 172A), or Indian

tribe may only terminate a benefits agreement under this title—

“(1) concerning a repository or a monitored retrievable storage facility, if the Secretary disqualifies the site under consideration for its failure to comply with technical requirements established by the Secretary in accordance with this Act; or

“(2) concerning a repository, if the Commission issues a final decision disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1).”.

SEC. 405. PRIORITY FUNDING FOR CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subtitle G of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10174 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 176. PRIORITY FUNDING FOR CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In providing any funding to institutions of higher education from the Waste Fund, the Secretary shall prioritize institutions of higher education that are located in the State of Nevada.

“(b) *DEFINITION.*—In this section, the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—The table of contents for the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 175, the following:

“Sec. 176. Priority funding for certain institutions of higher education.”.

SEC. 406. DISPOSAL OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL.

Section 122 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10142) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Any economic benefits derived from the retrieval of spent nuclear fuel pursuant to this section shall be shared with the State in which the repository is located, affected units of local government, and affected Indian tribes.”.

SEC. 407. UPDATED REPORT.

Section 175(a) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10174a(a)) is amended by striking “Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987” and inserting “Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018”.

TITLE V—FUNDING

SEC. 501. ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF FEES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 302(a)(4) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “(4) Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(4) ASSESSMENT, COLLECTION, AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—

“(A) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—Not later than”;

(B) by striking “the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “the date of enactment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018”; and

(C) by striking “collection and payment” and inserting “assessment”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “collection of the fee” and inserting “such amount”;

(3) in the third sentence, by striking “are being collected” and inserting “will result from such amounts”;

(4) in the fifth sentence, by striking “a period of 90 days of continuous session” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “the date that is 180 days after the date of such transmittal.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) COLLECTION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—

“(i) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018, the Secretary

shall establish procedures for the collection and payment of the fees established by paragraph (2) and paragraph (3), or adjusted pursuant to subparagraph (A).

“(ii) *LIMITATION ON COLLECTION.*—The Secretary may not collect a fee established under paragraph (2), including a fee established under paragraph (2) and adjusted pursuant to subparagraph (A)—

“(I) until the date on which the Commission issues a final decision approving or disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1); and

“(II) after such date, in an amount that will cause the total amount of fees collected under this subsection in any fiscal year to exceed 90 percent of the amounts appropriated for that fiscal year for purposes described in subsection (d).

The limitation in subclause (II) shall not apply during a fiscal year if, at any time during that fiscal year, the Waste Fund has a balance of zero.

“(iii) *PAYMENT OF FULL AMOUNTS.*—Notwithstanding the noncollection of a fee by the Secretary pursuant to clause (ii) in any fiscal year, a person who has entered into a contract with the Secretary under this subsection shall pay any uncollected amounts when determined necessary by the Secretary, subject to clause (ii), for purposes described in subsection (d).”.

(b) *AUTHORITY TO MODIFY CONTRACTS.*—The Secretary of Energy may seek to modify a contract entered into under section 302(a) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(a)) before the date of enactment of this Act to ensure that the contract complies with the provisions of such section, as amended by this Act.

(c) *TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—Section 302(a) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “126(b)”;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “insure” and inserting “ensure”.

SEC. 502. USE OF WASTE FUND.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 302(d) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “maintenance and monitoring” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end and inserting “maintenance and monitoring of any repository or test and evaluation facility constructed under this Act”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “to be disposed of” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end and inserting “to be disposed of in a repository or to be used in a test and evaluation facility”;

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “at a repository site” and all that follows through the end and inserting “at a repository site or a test and evaluation facility site and necessary or incident to such repository or test and evaluation facility”;

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) payments under benefits agreements for a repository entered into under section 170 or 172A.”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—Section 117(d) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10137(d)) is amended by inserting “designated with respect to a repository” after “such representatives”.

SEC. 503. ANNUAL MULTIYEAR BUDGET PROPOSAL.

Section 302(e)(2) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(e)(2)) is amended by

striking “triennially” and inserting “annually”.

SEC. 504. AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS.

Section 302 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) *LIMITATION ON FUNDING.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Beginning on the date of first spent fuel receipt at a repository, no amount may be appropriated in any fiscal year for activities relating to the repository, including transportation of additional spent fuel to the repository and operation of the repository, unless the applicable amount required with respect to the repository under section 171(a)(1)(B) or section 171(a)(1)(C) is appropriated for that fiscal year.

“(2) *DEFINITION.*—In this subsection, the terms ‘spent fuel’ and ‘first spent fuel receipt’ have the meaning given such terms in section 171(a).

“(g) *OFFSETTING FUNDING.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Fees collected after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018 pursuant to subsection (a) shall be credited to the Waste Fund and available, to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts and consistent with the requirements of this section, to carry out activities authorized to be funded from the Waste Fund.

“(2) *OFFSETTING COLLECTION.*—Fees collected in a fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations for such activities and shall be classified as discretionary appropriations as defined by section 250(c)(7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(7)).

“(3) *ESTIMATES.*—For the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and for determining points of order pursuant to that Act or any concurrent resolution on the budget, an estimate provided under those Acts for a provision in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides discretionary appropriations, derived from amounts in the Waste Fund, for such activities shall include in that estimate the amount of such fees that will be collected during the fiscal year for which such appropriation is made available. Any such estimate shall not include any change in net direct spending as result in the appropriation of such fees.”.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. CERTAIN STANDARDS AND CRITERIA.

(a) *GENERALLY APPLICABLE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA.*—

(1) *ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY STANDARDS.*—

(A) *DETERMINATION AND REPORT.*—Not later than 2 years after the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a final decision approving or disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization for a repository under section 114(d)(1) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10134(d)) (as so designated by this Act), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(i) determine if the generally applicable standards promulgated under section 121(a) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10141(a)) should be updated; and

(ii) submit to Congress a report on such determination.

(B) *RULE.*—If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency determines, under subparagraph (A), that the generally applicable standards promulgated under section 121(a) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10141(a)) should be updated, the Administrator, not later than 2 years after submission of the report under subparagraph (A)(ii), shall, by rule, promulgate updated generally applicable standards under such section.

(2) *COMMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND CRITERIA.*—Not later than 2 years after the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency

promulgates updated generally applicable standards pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), the Commission shall, by rule, promulgate updated technical requirements and criteria under section 121(b) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10141(b)) as necessary to be consistent with such updated generally applicable standards.

(b) **SITE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS AND CRITERIA.**—Nothing in this section shall affect the standards, technical requirements, and criteria promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the Yucca Mountain site under section 801 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 10141 note).

SEC. 602. APPLICATION.

Section 135 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10155) is amended by striking subsection (h) and redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h).

SEC. 603. TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ASSISTANCE.

Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10175(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(c) **TRAINING AND ASSISTANCE.**—

“(1) **TRAINING.**—The Secretary”; and

(2) by striking “The Waste Fund” and inserting the following:

“(2) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, provide in-kind, financial, technical, and other appropriate assistance, for safety activities related to the transportation of high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel, to any entity receiving technical assistance or funds under paragraph (1).

“(3) **SOURCE OF FUNDING.**—The Waste Fund”.

SEC. 604. OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT.

(a) **AMENDMENT TO THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1982.**—Subsection (b) of section 304 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10224(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **DIRECTOR.**—

“(1) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Director of the Office shall be responsible for carrying out the functions of the Secretary under this Act. The Director of the Office shall report directly to the Secretary.

“(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—The Director of the Office shall be appointed from among persons who have extensive expertise and experience in organizational and project management.

“(3) **TENURE.**—The Director of the Office may serve not more than two 5-year terms.

“(4) **SERVICE DURING INTERIM PERIOD.**—Upon expiration of the Director’s term, the Director may continue to serve until the earlier of—

“(A) the date on which a new Director is confirmed; or

“(B) the date that is one year after the date of such expiration.

“(5) **REMOVAL.**—The President may remove the Director only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. If the President removes the Director, the President shall submit to Congress a statement explaining the reason for such removal.”.

(b) **TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 203(a) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7133(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (8).

(2) **TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.**—The functions described in the paragraph (8) stricken by the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be transferred to and performed by the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, as provided in section 304 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10224).

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Section 2(17) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101(17)) is amended by striking “section 305” and inserting “section 304”.

SEC. 605. WEST LAKE LANDFILL.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the

Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report containing the final remedy to be implemented at the West Lake Landfill and the expected timeline for implementation of such final remedy.

SEC. 606. SUBSEABED OR OCEAN WATER DISPOSAL.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Section 5 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10104) is amended—

(1) by striking “Nothing in this Act” and inserting:

“(a) **EFFECT ON MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH, AND SANCTUARIES ACT OF 1972.**—Nothing in this Act”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **SUBSEABED OR OCEAN WATER DISPOSAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(1) the subseabed or ocean water disposal of spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste is prohibited; and

“(2) no funds shall be obligated for any activity relating to the subseabed or ocean water disposal of spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste.”.

(b) **REPEAL.**—Section 224 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and the item relating thereto in the table of contents for such Act, are repealed.

SEC. 607. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING STORAGE OF NUCLEAR WASTE NEAR THE GREAT LAKES.

It is the Sense of Congress that the Governments of the United States and Canada should not allow permanent or long-term storage of spent nuclear fuel or other radioactive waste near the Great Lakes.

SEC. 608. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) **STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-665. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-665.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI, add the following section:

SEC. 609. REQUIREMENT FOR FINANCIAL STATEMENTS SUMMARY.

The Department of Energy shall include a financial statements summary in each audit report on the Department of Energy Nuclear Waste Fund’s fiscal year financial statement audit.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Congressman SHIMKUS for his support of this amendment. I would also like to thank Congressman TONKO as well, and express my support for the underlying bill, which will, among many other things, prioritize decommissioned nuclear plants for removal of spent waste.

The hard work to come to this stage has been important, and we are finally moving forward.

In 2015, news broke that the nuclear plant in my district would be decommissioned in 2019. Unfortunately, this plant has also been in the news quite a bit because of significant safety concerns. So the communities back home are intimately aware of the safety and security risks to local neighborhoods and plant employees, and local officials and stakeholders have worked hard to hold plant operators accountable to prepare for all the risks presented, and to demand a plan for what happens after the plant is decommissioned so that the families and the businesses in my district are not left high and dry.

I offered a number of amendments to H.R. 3035, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act. They included efforts to strengthen local stakeholder engagement, to support funding for communities where spent nuclear fuel is awaiting transfer, to ensure the safe storage of spent nuclear fuel at decommissioned or soon-to-be decommissioned plants. And I offered these amendments because of the safety of the communities that are affected by nuclear plants and the nuclear storage sites, the importance of that being recognized.

And while some of these ideas weren’t included in the particular bill, the amendment I offer now is fundamental to making sure that they will be ultimately addressed.

Congress created the Nuclear Waste Fund to fund a solution to civilian nuclear waste that would provide for safe disposal in a permanent repository. These funds came from funds paid by ratepayers and generated by tens of billions of dollars, \$31 billion as of 2014, to support a solution for dealing with nuclear waste in a safe and secure manner.

And in the issuance of what is happening with this fund, the administration ceased making an easy-to-read summary to be part of that. The American people deserve to know just how this fund is being managed, and that any expenditure is actually necessary or justified and publicly reported and easily digested by local officials and the public as a whole.

For this, transparency really is key. We should be making it as easy as possible for the public and the officials that oversee this fund, and my amendment does just that by requiring a clear, plain English summary to accompany annual reporting on the Nuclear Waste Fund's financial status.

The information about the fund should not be only accessible to those who can understand the technical information contained in the full report. When communities like mine are working as hard as they can possibly work under the circumstances to make sure that they keep families safe, we should be making every possible tool available to them to achieve this goal.

Transparency around the fund created by ratepayers and intended to support a permanent solution to the safety risks they face from nuclear waste is only one piece of that, but an important piece.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING). I think this is a very needed amendment.

I would say one of the most frustrating things about this process, and my colleagues on the other side know, is that we passed this bill in June of last year. And then we had the funding, and the money, and the debate, and the trust fund, and appropriators and budgeters.

Anything we can do to clear out and get some clear guidance on the money, we may have to then move to another piece of legislation to really clarify. Our bill does that for new revenue coming in, so I think it is a great addition, and I appreciate him coming down.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for his leadership on this issue. For so long we have been trying to get a solution and to get proper use made out of Yucca Mountain and the billions of dollars that ratepayers all across the Nation have spent.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan amendment as well that is brought forward by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) to bring more light to show the ratepayers of the country what is exactly happening with this Nuclear Waste Fund.

But the underlying bill is critical to our national energy strategy because, for decades, going back to the 1980s, this country, through Congress, established that there will be a national nuclear waste storage facility, and yet it

has gone unused. The money has gone unutilized, and there is no facility right now that is working.

We have got to make this work for the ratepayers all across the country who pay billions of dollars into this fund. We need a national repository for spent nuclear fuel. This bill finally achieves that.

I congratulate my friend, Mr. SHIMKUS, for spending years finally getting us to a point where we can move this bill across the House floor, and hopefully the Senate moves this bill to the President's desk so we can finally resolve this long-lasting issue that ratepayers all across the Nation deserve to have an answer to.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to end by saying I know there are some rumblings out there about what is this litigation fund being paid for and who is paying for it?

The United States Government is being sued. We have to make these payments because we are not abiding by the law. It is not the private industry.

There are rumblings out there about: Oh, we are relieving the nuclear industry of reliability. That is absolutely false. We are going to protect U.S. taxpayers from the liability that we are paying because the Federal Government is not complying with the law.

And I want to make that straight. That is accountability, that is transparency. That is what my colleague Mr. KEATING is doing.

And with that, I support his amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who has worked tirelessly on this issue as well and with a strong spirit of bipartisan cooperation on this bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I know that this takes the issue and the response of this bill and makes it even stronger. With that in mind, I thank my colleague and those with whom he worked on this amendment for their input, and for, again, an amendment that makes the response so much stronger.

With that, I plan to support the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, once again, I want to thank everyone who has worked so hard: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TONKO, and all of the people who are finally moving this ahead. It is a very important issue in terms of our energy. It is very important in terms of safety of our communities. We have finally got the ball rolling, so again, I thank them for their hard work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-665.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 609. STRANDED NUCLEAR WASTE.

(a) STRANDED NUCLEAR WASTE TASK FORCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a task force, to be known as the Stranded Nuclear Waste Task Force—

(A) to conduct a study on existing public and private resources and funding for which affected communities may be eligible; and

(B) to develop immediate and long-term economic adjustment plans tailored to the needs of each affected community.

(2) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Stranded Nuclear Waste Task Force shall complete and submit to Congress the study described in paragraph (1).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFECTED COMMUNITY.—The term “affected community” means a municipality that contains stranded nuclear waste within the boundaries of the municipality, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(3) STRANDED NUCLEAR WASTE.—The term “stranded nuclear waste” means nuclear waste or spent nuclear fuel stored in dry casks or spent fuel pools at a decommissioned or decommissioning nuclear facility.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment which would help those communities saddled with housing our Nation's stranded nuclear waste while the Federal Government has failed to meet its legal obligation to find a permanent repository.

This is something my constituents understand all too well. The former Zion Nuclear Power Station, located on valuable lakefront property in Zion, Illinois, has housed more than 2 million pounds of spent nuclear fuel since the plant's closure in 1998.

This waste, situated on the very shores of Lake Michigan, is both an extreme environmental hazard and a severe burden to the quality of life of the residents of Zion—detering economic investment, depressing home values, and driving up property taxes to fill the void of local revenue.

Zion is not alone. Across the country, there are 17 nuclear power plants at various stages of decommissioning with even more announced closures slated for years ahead. In these communities, plants are typically the largest employer in the area; and when they close and waste is stored on site, it is devastating to the local communities.

My amendment seeks to help these communities access desperately needed Federal resources until waste is moved—waste that is, quite literally, stranded in these communities due to the Federal Government's inaction. Specifically, my amendment would require the Secretary of Energy to assemble a task force to work across all Federal agencies to identify existing resources and funding opportunities that could assist communities with decommissioning plants where waste is being stored.

In addition, the task force would work with communities in the decommissioning process to develop a transition plan to mitigate the economic damage when a plant closes. Communities like Zion, Illinois, have been forced to shoulder the burdens of storage with no compensation in return.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and help our communities get the Federal help they are owed.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my friend.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my fellow Great Lakes Member, Representative SCHNEIDER, for yielding the time. I also want to thank the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Congresswoman LOWEY, for offering this amendment.

I rise in support of this effort to help communities that are left with radioactive waste after the closure of a nuclear power plant. The Great Lakes region, I might point out, has no energy umbrella like the Bureau of Reclamation for the 17 Western States, or for portions of the South, the Tennessee Valley Authority, that can help communities readjust on a large scale for energy disruptions or changes.

In my district of northern Ohio, the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station is scheduled to be shuttered. We are not waving the white flag just yet, but this community and its people need the tools to cope with the aftermath, should the worst happen.

When nuclear power plants close, the impact on local economies, due to the loss of jobs and tax revenue, will be severe. For years, the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station has provided 700 good jobs and generated \$20 million a year in tax revenue for a rural county, called Ottawa County, in which \$12.1 million each year goes to its school district. That 900-megawatt power plant does more than produce power. It builds community.

This major financial support could disappear and leave the community and that entire county struggling to support schools, law enforcement, and roads. Therefore, I strongly support this amendment to help these communities adjust, as necessary, to access Federal resources and make a plan for economic revitalization.

I thank Congressman SCHNEIDER for offering this commonsense amendment, one that is so vitally necessary, especially across the Great Lakes region, which is so often neglected. I also

want to thank Chairman SHIMKUS and Ranking Member TONKO for their leadership and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from Illinois—one of the Chicagolandians that I talk about—for bringing this amendment. I use his district—and I have used it for years—to talk about the challenges that we face if we do nothing.

This authorization bill is designed to start doing something, and, actually, it is designed to help us comply with the law that is already written.

Zion is the perfect example of the need to move spent nuclear fuel to an interim site and then a final geological repository, thus, freeing up, obviously, great lakefront opportunities on the Great Lakes for redevelopment that would help this community that suffered because of the closure.

I am glad the gentleman is here. I appreciate the amendment. I am going back to what MARK SANFORD said: This is a national problem. We need a national solution. That is what we are trying to do now in a bipartisan manner. Good job. I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my friend and a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for working with me on this very important amendment.

Indian Point Energy Center, in my district, is scheduled to cease operations in 2021. When the plant closes, the village of Buchanan will be left with a large amount of stranded nuclear waste on site.

This amendment would help Buchanan and the town of Cortlandt access vital resources for economic redevelopment. Until the Department of Energy takes title to nuclear waste and removes it from our communities, the Federal Government must do all it can to support these de facto interim storage sites.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I have the right to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) has the right to close.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I again thank my colleague. I don't know if he

was in the Chamber when I mentioned that Chicagoland has 55 million visitors and 10,000 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel. We would like to solve that problem. The gentleman's amendment helps the communities as we transition. It is additive to the overall bill. I am happy to support it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his hard work on this and his support.

I yield 30 seconds to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding, and I stand in support of the amendment.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from New York for their hard work on the amendment and for the sensitivity shown to the people in host communities for our nuclear facilities across our country.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and encourage our colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate all of the support. I appreciate the work of my colleagues. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-665.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows through the end of the Rules Committee Print, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Nuclear Waste Informed Consent Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms "affected Indian tribe", "affected unit of local government", "high-level radioactive waste", "repository", "Secretary", "spent nuclear fuel", "unit of general local government", and "Waste Fund" have the meanings given the terms in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

SEC. 3. CONSENT BASED APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not make an expenditure from the Waste Fund for the costs of the activities described in paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 302(d) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(d)) unless the Secretary has entered into an agreement to host a repository with—

(1) the Governor of the State in which the repository is proposed to be located;

(2) each affected unit of local government;

(3) any unit of general local government contiguous to the affected unit of local government if spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste will be transported

through that unit of general local government for disposal at the repository; and

(4) each affected Indian tribe.

(b) CONDITIONS ON AGREEMENT.—Any agreement to host a repository under this Act—

(1) shall be in writing and signed by all parties;

(2) shall be binding on the parties; and

(3) shall not be amended or revoked except by mutual agreement of the parties.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which is also supported by my Nevada colleague (Mr. KIHUEN) is very simple and straightforward. It sets up consent-based site decision-making as an alternative to “Screwing Nevada 2.0,” which just continues the process that has lasted 36 years, has cost \$15 billion, is going nowhere in the Senate, and has nothing to show for it but a big hole in the ground.

Consent-based siting, on the other hand, is fair. Nevada doesn’t want your nuclear waste. We didn’t get any benefits from it, and we didn’t generate it. But Texas and New Mexico do want it, so why not let them have it?

It is also a sound policy. It was the number one recommendation of the esteemed Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future. Now, you can argue the politics, you can distort the science, you can assert it is the law—as though a 1982 policy is the Ten Commandments—but you can’t have the truth.

Now, my colleagues don’t want this dangerous waste in their backyards any more than Nevadans do. I get that. That is pretty easy to understand. But it is funny, they didn’t mind the jobs; they didn’t mind the tax revenue, the cheap power, and the political support they got from the nuclear power industry over the years that it has existed. Now, they just want somebody else to clean up their mess.

Well, I say, instead of screwing Nevada one more time, why don’t we really work together so we can finally and effectively solve the problem? We could do this with consent-based siting for both interim and permanent storage facilities. This would be a real solution that could take us into the future. So I would urge my colleagues to support the Titus amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the State of Nevada has benefited from the nuclear age. It helped us win World War II. Also, Nevada pays for our inability to comply with the law because, nationally, we pay out of the Judgment Fund. So the taxpayers of the State of Nevada are paying,

through Federal tax liabilities, for us not complying with the law. So I just want to make that straight.

There are two main problems with my colleague’s amendment. One is—and it is just the language—it is a striking bill, which says that, all of this debate of interim storage that we are having, her amendment strikes that. All of the discussion about how we are trying to protect the ratepayers—especially in the future—her amendment strikes that.

Her amendment strikes the final regulatory review of the Yucca Mountain site. The NRC, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, said in their safety evaluation report that Yucca Mountain would be safe for 1 million years.

□ 1045

Current law allows the State of Nevada to challenge that, but my colleague’s amendment strikes that. And what we have done in this legislation is we have said: We understand the concerns of the State of Nevada. Current law says: Because you vetoed it, you get no benefits.

In this bill, we said: That is not fair. We are going to allow the State of Nevada to receive the benefits that they request in moving forward. Your amendment strikes that, so your amendment strikes the opportunity for the State of Nevada to get any benefits once we move forward.

The other part of the problem with this amendment is the terminology is very vague as to local government entities. And we think that is probably intentional. It is intentional so that you can never get a number of local entities to ever decide. We kind of looked at, based upon the way the language is written, who would be considered. Well, a local entity, a community in the State of Utah, Minersville, population 887, 300 miles from the site, could be able to veto this national solution to a national problem.

Now, that means—and I can’t wait to visit Minersville someday—that they are going to have more power than the Federal Government and this Chamber. They are going to have the veto authority over the State of New Jersey or the State of Illinois or the State of—I don’t know how many States came here to debate on this bill. Quite a few.

So a couple problems: the first problem is, it is a strike amendment, which means everything that you have done, all those adjustments that I have worked in a bipartisan manner, throw them out; and that you cannot get to understand the universe of local communities that would have a veto over this national solution to a national problem.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I would just respond to two things. I thank the gentleman for recognizing what Nevada did to help win the Cold War. We were the site of

atomic testing for years. We still bear those scars. But this is not about military waste; this is about commercial waste.

Second, while I appreciate the chairman’s concern about Nevada and giving us benefits, the health and safety of Nevadans is not for sale to the nuclear power industry.

Mr. Chair, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my colleague and the ranking member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I think we can agree on one thing. The status quo is not acceptable. Dispersed around the country in wet pools, in insecure casks—right. We need to deal with that. This is not the perfect solution, and it is destined to fail in the Senate.

Why do we commission blue ribbon commissions of experts—are we the experts?—and then ignore their advice? They made four major points: the solution must be adaptive, it must be staged, it must be consent-based, and it must be transparent.

This bill assumes we are going into Yucca Mountain, which has been proven to be geologically unstable and unsuitable. Therefore, this amendment should be adopted. The bill should fail.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad my friend from Oregon mentioned the blue ribbon commission. The blue ribbon commission was told: Do not consider Yucca Mountain. So come on. Really? Pull out the blue ribbon commission and say “this is the truth” when they were told: Consider everything else, but you can’t consider the law of the land. Preposterous.

To my colleague, Chairman WALDEN—actually in Oregon—this is Hanford. These are the tanks next to the Columbia River, which goes next to Oregon. And you are saying it has no defense-related provisions for this bill? Come on now. Let’s move forward.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are advised to direct their remarks to the Chair, not to each other.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, that is in Washington. It is not in Oregon. If you don’t even know where Hanford is, I am not sure you really understand what took place there.

I would just say: The law of the land, that is a great argument. You forgot about that argument when you tried to repeal ObamaCare 60 times and have done everything you can to roll back Dodd-Frank. So law of the land is a pretty weak, specious argument.

This is not just about the safety of Nevada. This is about doing what is right, finding a policy that will work, that is based on consent, that the experts say is the way to go, that has a chance to get out of the Senate and really move us forward so we do quit wasting time, so we do quit wasting money, and we find a real solution to

an issue that does affect the entire Nation.

That is why it should be consent based. That is why I think we should support this amendment and oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, I would say again, please keep in mind that this has an opportunity to pass. It will really solve the problem. It will not turn the clock back to an old way that has failed, that is faulty science, bad politics, and even worse policy.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 332, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

AYES—80

Amodei	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Bass	Hastings	Payne
Bonamici	Huffman	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
F.	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Kaptur	Polis
Capuano	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Carson (IN)	Khanna	Rosen
Castro (TX)	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Ciциlline	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Loeb sack	Schiff
Correa	Lofgren	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham,	Sherman
DeSaulnier	M.	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Soto
Ellison	Maloney,	Suozzi
Engel	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McCollum	Titus
Espallat	McGovern	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Veasey
Gabbard	Meng	Velázquez
Galleo	Moore	Wasserman
Garamendi	Nadler	Schultz
Gomez	Napolitano	Waters, Maxine
Green, Al	O'Halleran	Wilson (FL)

NOES—332

Abraham	Blum	Chabot
Adams	Blumenauer	Cheney
Aderholt	Blunt Rochester	Clark (MA)
Aguilar	Bost	Clay
Allen	Brady (PA)	Clyburn
Amash	Brady (TX)	Coffman
Arrington	Brat	Cohen
Babin	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Bacon	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Banks (IN)	Brownley (CA)	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Buchanan	Comer
Barr	Buck	Comstock
Barragán	Bucshon	Conaway
Barton	Burgess	Connolly
Beatty	Bustos	Cook
Bera	Butterfield	Cooper
Bergman	Byrne	Costa
Beyer	Calvert	Costello (PA)
Biggs	Carballo	Courtney
Bilirakis	Cárdenas	Cramer
Bishop (GA)	Carter (GA)	Crawford
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Crist
Bishop (UT)	Cartwright	Cuellar
Blackburn	Castor (FL)	Culberson

Cummings	Kelly (MS)	Rice (NY)
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Curtis	Kennedy	Richmond
Davidson	Kildee	Roby
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Roe (TN)
Davis, Rodney	Kind	Rogers (AL)
DeGette	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Delaney	King (NY)	Rokita
DeBene	Kinzing	Rooney, Francis
Demings	Knight	Rooney, Thomas
Denham	Krishnamoorthi	J.
Dent	Kustoff (TN)	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	LaHood	Roskam
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Ross
Diaz-Balart	Lamb	Rothfus
Dingell	Lamborn	Rouzer
Donovan	Lance	Royce (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Langevin	Ruiz
F.	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Duffy	Larson (CT)	Russell
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Rutherford
Duncan (TN)	Lawrence	Sanford
Dunn	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Emmer	Lesko	Scalise
Estes (KS)	Levin	Schneider
Esty (CT)	Lewis (MN)	Schrader
Evans	Lipinski	Schweikert
Faso	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Ferguson	Long	Scott, Austin
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Scott, David
Fleischmann	Love	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Lowey	Sessions
Fortenberry	Lucas	Sewell (AL)
Foster	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Fox	Lynch	Shuster
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Simpson
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Sinema
Gaetz	Marino	Sires
Gallagher	Marshall	Smith (MO)
Garrett	Massie	Smith (NE)
Gianforte	Mast	Smith (NJ)
Gibbs	Matsui	Smith (TX)
Gohmert	McCarthy	Smucker
Gonzalez (TX)	McCauley	Stefanik
Goodlatte	McClintock	Stewart
Gosar	McEachin	Stivers
Gowdy	McHenry	Swalwell (CA)
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Takano
Graves (LA)	McMorris	Taylor
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Tenney
Green, Gene	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Griffith	McSally	Thompson (PA)
Grothman	Meadows	Thornberry
Guthrie	Messer	Tipton
Gutiérrez	Mitchell	Tonko
Hanabusa	Moolenaar	Torres
Handel	Mooney (WV)	Trott
Harper	Moulton	Tsongas
Harris	Mullin	Turner
Hartzler	Murphy (FL)	Upton
Heck	Neal	Valadao
Hensarling	Newhouse	Vela
Herrera Beutler	Noem	Visclosky
Hice, Jody B.	Nolan	Wagner
Higgins (NY)	Norcross	Walberg
Hill	Norman	Walden
Himes	Nunes	Walker
Holding	Olson	Walorski
Hollingsworth	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
Hoyer	Pallone	Walz
Hudson	Palmer	Watson Coleman
Huizenga	Panetta	Weber (TX)
Hultgren	Pascrell	Webster (FL)
Hunter	Paulsen	Welch
Hurd	Pearce	Wenstrup
Issa	Perry	Westerman
Jayapal	Peters	Williams
Jeffries	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Jenkins (KS)	Pingree	Wittman
Johnson (LA)	Poe (TX)	Womack
Johnson (OH)	Poliquin	Woodall
Johnson, E. B.	Posey	Yarmuth
Johnson, Sam	Price (NC)	Yoder
Jordan	Quigley	Yoho
Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe	Young (AK)
Katko	Reed	Young (IA)
Keating	Reichert	Zeldin
	Renacci	

NOT VOTING—16

Black	Granger	Pittenger
Budd	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Crowley	Jones	Rush
DeLauro	Kuster (NH)	Speier
Deutch	Labrador	
Gottheimer	Marchant	

□ 1115

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Ms. HER-RERA BEUTLER, Messrs. BIGGS, BISHOP of Michigan, SWALWELL of California, NEAL, and Ms. FUDGE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3053) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 879, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 340, noes 72, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

AYES—340

Abraham	Bacon	Bera
Adams	Banks (IN)	Bergman
Aderholt	Barletta	Beyer
Aguilar	Barr	Biggs
Allen	Barragán	Bilirakis
Arrington	Barton	Bishop (GA)
Babin	Beatty	Bishop (MI)

Blackburn Gosar
Blum Gowdy
Blunt Rochester Graves (GA)
Bonamici Graves (LA)
Bost Graves (MO)
Brady (PA) Green, Gene
Brady (TX) Griffith
Brat Grothman
Brooks (AL) Guthrie
Brooks (IN) Hanabusa
Brown (MD) Handel
Brownley (CA) Harper
Buchanan Harris
Buck Hartzler
Bucshon Heck
Burgess Hensarling
Bustos Herrera Beutler
Butterfield Hice, Jody B.
Byrne Higgins (LA)
Calvert Higgins (NY)
Capuano Hill
Carbajal Himes
Cárdenas Holding
Carson (IN) Hollingsworth
Carter (GA) Hoyer
Carter (TX) Hudson
Cartwright Huizenga
Castor (FL) Hultgren
Chabot Hunter
Cheney Hurd
Chu, Judy Issa
Clark (MA) Jenkins (KS)
Clay Johnson (LA)
Cleaver Johnson (OH)
Clyburn Johnson, E. B.
Coffman Johnson, Sam
Cohen Jordan
Cole Joyce (OH)
Collins (GA) Kaptur
Collins (NY) Katko
Comer Keating
Comstock Kelly (IL)
Conaway Kelly (MS)
Connolly Kelly (PA)
Cook Kennedy
Cooper Kildee
Costa Kilmer
Costello (PA) Kind
Courtney King (IA)
Cramer King (NY)
Crawford Kinzinger
Cuellar Knight
Culberson Krishnamoorthi
Cummings Kustoff (TN)
Curbelo (FL) LaHood
Curtis LaMalfa
Davidson Lamb
Davis (CA) Lamborn
Davis, Rodney Lamborn
DeGette Langevin
DeLaney Larsen (WA)
DeBene Larson (CT)
Demings Latta
Denham Lawrence
Dent Lawson (FL)
DeSantis Lesko
DesJarlais Levin
Diaz-Balart Lewis (MN)
Dingell Lieu, Ted
Donovan Lipinski
Doyle, Michael LoBiondo
F. Long
Duffy Loudermilk
Duncan (SC) Lowenthal
Duncan (TN) Lowey
Dunn Lucas
Emmer Luetkemeyer
Estes (KS) Lynch
Esty (CT) MacArthur
Evans Maloney, Sean
Faso Marino
Ferguson Marshall
Fitzpatrick Mast
Fleischmann Matsui
Flores McCarthy
Fortenberry McCaul
Foster McClintock
Foxy McCollum
Frelinghuysen McEachin
Fudge McHenry
Gaetz McKinley
Gallagher McMorris
Garrett Rodgers
Gianforte McNerney
Gibbs McSally
Gohmert Meadows
Gomez Messer
Gonzalez (TX) Mitchell
Goodlatte Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Lance
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela

Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—72

Amash
Amodei
Bass
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Correa
Crist
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeSaulnier
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españal
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Gutiérrez

NOT VOTING—16

Black
Budd
Crowley
DeLauro
Deutsch
Gottheimer

Granger
Grijalva
Jenkins (WV)
Jones
Kuster (NH)
Labrador

Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Vargas
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Yarmuth

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 179, answered “present” 2, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—207

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
DeBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duffy
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Evans
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Olson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
Lamb
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin

Nadler
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Palazzo
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Roby
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Takano
Thornberry
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)

NAYS—179

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barragán
Bass
Bera

Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost

Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Capuano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1124

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall Vote No. 179 on H.R. 3053, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, on final passage of H.R. 3053, The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, I inadvertently cast my vote contrary to my own intentions. I intended to vote “no” on that bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for rollcall vote 178. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.” Additionally, on rollcall No. 179, I was inadvertently recorded as voting “nay.” I support H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, and my vote should be recorded as “yea.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Carbajal	Jenkins (KS)	Poliquin
Cárdenas	Johnson (OH)	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Ratcliffe
Castor (FL)	Joyce (OH)	Reed
Clark (MA)	Katko	Renacci
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Richmond
Cleaver	Khanna	Roe (TN)
Coffman	Kihuen	Rogers (AL)
Conaway	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen
Correa	Kind	Rosen
Costa	Kinzinger	Roskam
Costello (PA)	Knight	Rouzer
Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	LaHood	Ruiz
DeFazio	Lance	Rutherford
Delaney	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Denham	Latta	Sánchez
DeSantis	Lee	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Levin	Sarbanes
Doyle, Michael	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
F.	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Serrano
Emmer	Loebsock	Sewell (AL)
Espallat	Lofgren	Sinema
Esty (CT)	Love	Sires
Faso	Luján, Ben Ray	Soto
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Stivers
Flores	MacArthur	Swalwell (CA)
Foxx	Maloney,	Tenney
Fudge	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
Gaetz	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Gallagher	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Gohmert	Mast	Tipton
Gomez	McKinley	Torres
Gonzalez (TX)	McMorris	Turner
Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Upton
Graves (LA)	McSally	Valadao
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Vargas
Green, Al	Napolitano	Veasey
Green, Gene	Neal	Vela
Grijalva	Nolan	Velázquez
Gutiérrez	Norcross	Visclosky
Hanabusa	O'Halleran	Walberg
Hastings	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Hill	Palmer	Weber (TX)
Holding	Panetta	Wenstrup
Hoyer	Paulsen	Wittman
Hudson	Payne	Woodall
Hurd	Pearce	Yoder
Jackson Lee	Perry	Yoho
Jayapal	Peterson	Young (AK)
Jeffries	Poe (TX)	Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

NOT VOTING—40

Black	Griffith	McGovern
Budd	Harris	O'Rourke
Cheney	Hice, Jody B.	Pascarell
Cohen	Higgins (NY)	Pittenger
Connolly	Jenkins (WV)	Quigley
Courtney	Jones	Reichert
Crowley	Keating	Rice (NY)
DeLauro	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Deutch	Kuster (NH)	Smith (MO)
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Speier
Dunn	LaMalfa	Suozi
Gibbs	Larson (CT)	Taylor
Gottheimer	Marchant	
Granger	Massie	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1131

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 2018, I was absent for recorded votes 178, 179, and 180. Had I been present, on rollcall 178 I would have voted "yes", on rollcall 179 I would have voted "no"; and on rollcall 180 I would have voted "no".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal conflict, I unfortunately missed votes today.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 178 "yea" on rollcall No. 179 and "yea" on rollcall No. 180.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Gabrielle Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1468

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor from H.R. 1468.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.RES. 774

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor from H. Res. 774.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor from H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING ROBUST RELATIONS WITH THE STATE OF ISRAEL BILATERALLY AND IN MULTILATERAL FORA UPON SEVENTY YEARS OF STATEHOOD

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 835) supporting robust relations with the State of Israel bilaterally and in multilateral fora upon seventy years of statehood, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 835

Whereas May 14, 2018, marks the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel;

Whereas May 11, 2018, marks the 69th anniversary of Israel's membership in the United Nations;

Whereas on May 14, 1948, the United States officially recognized Israel as a state;

Whereas Israel offers invaluable contributions to the international community, including to the fields of start-up economies, entrepreneurship, cyber security, military weaponry, counter-terrorism, intelligence gathering, airport security, agriculture, water management, arid-zone farming, medical advances, natural gas, and other technologies;

Whereas in 2000, with the support of the United States Government, Israel was accepted into the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) at the United Nations headquarters in New York, and its membership became permanent in 2004;

Whereas in 2013 Israel also became a member of WEOG at the United Nations bodies in Geneva;

Whereas WEOG membership made possible the election for 2016-17 of Israel's Ambassador as the chair of the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, and in 2017, Israel's election to the Executive Board of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women);

Whereas in May 2017, Israel was elected as one of the Vice-Presidents of the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas robust bilateral ties with Israel maximizes security, economic, and cultural benefits in the region, increases regional stability and builds confidence with respect to peace negotiations;

Whereas Israel maintains diplomatic relations with 158 nations and retains 79 resident embassies, 22 consulates general, and 6 special missions globally;

Whereas Israel maintains free trade agreements with the United States, members of the European Union, members of the European Free Trade Association, Canada, Turkey, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Mexico, Romania, Bulgaria, and Jordan;

Whereas in 1989, the United States Government designated Israel as a major non-NATO ally;

Whereas in 2014, the United States Government designated Israel as a "major strategic partner";

Whereas the United States and Israel have signed three 10-year memoranda of understanding, in which the United States committed to provide \$26,700,000,000 between fiscal year 1999 and fiscal year 2008, \$30,000,000,000 between fiscal year 2009 and fiscal year 2018, and \$38,000,000,000 between fiscal year 2019 and fiscal year 2028;

Whereas Congress has appropriated amounts in accordance with such memoranda of understanding, reflecting the two countries' shared priorities in the region and the strength of United States support for maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge; and

Whereas Israel's involvement as an active member of the community of nations benefits both Israel and the United States, and allies who share common values and promote democratic stability throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) celebrates the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel;

(2) encourages equitable treatment of Israel in international fora;

(3) urges United Nations member states to support Israel's candidacy for the United Nations Security Council;

(4) encourages the diplomatic recognition of the state of Israel and robust engagement with Israel from all United States allies and from governments across the globe; and

(5) reiterates its support for a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish

state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) encourages equitable treatment of Israel in international fora;

(2) urges United Nations member states to support Israel's future candidacy for the United Nations Security Council;

(3) encourages the diplomatic recognition of the state of Israel and robust engagement with Israel from all United States allies and from governments across the globe; and

(4) reiterates its support for a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security.

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas May 14, 2018, marks the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel;

Whereas May 11, 2018, marks the 69th anniversary of Israel's membership in the United Nations;

Whereas on May 14, 1948, the United States officially recognized Israel as a state;

Whereas Israel offers invaluable contributions to the international community, including to the fields of start-up economies, entrepreneurship, cyber security, military weaponry, counter-terrorism, intelligence gathering, airport security, agriculture, water management, arid-zone farming, medical advances, natural gas, and other technologies;

Whereas in 2000, with the support of the United States Government, Israel was accepted into the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) at the United Nations headquarters in New York, and its membership became permanent in 2004;

Whereas in 2013 Israel also became a member of WEOG at the United Nations bodies in Geneva;

Whereas WEOG membership made possible the election for 2016–17 of Israel's Ambassador as the chair of the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, and in 2017, Israel's election to the Executive Board of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women);

Whereas in May 2017, Israel was elected as one of the Vice-Presidents of the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas robust bilateral ties with Israel maximizes security, economic, and cultural benefits in the region, increases regional stability and builds confidence with respect to peace negotiations;

Whereas Israel maintains diplomatic relations with 158 nations and retains 79 resident embassies, 22 consulates general, and 6 special missions globally;

Whereas Israel maintains free trade agreements with the United States, members of the European Union, members of the European Free Trade Association, Canada, Turkey, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Mexico, Romania, Bulgaria, and Jordan;

Whereas Israel has been designated by the United States Government as a major non-NATO ally;

Whereas in 2014, the United States Government designated Israel as a "major strategic partner";

Whereas the United States and Israel have signed three 10-year memoranda of understanding, in which the United States committed to provide \$26,700,000,000 between fiscal year 1999 and fiscal year 2008, \$30,000,000,000 between fiscal year 2009 and fiscal year 2018, and \$38,000,000,000 between fiscal year 2019 and fiscal year 2028;

Whereas Congress has appropriated amounts in accordance with such memoranda of understanding, reflecting the two countries' shared priorities in the region and the strength of United States support for maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge; and

Whereas Israel's involvement as an active member of the community of nations benefits both Israel and the United States, and allies who share common values and promote democratic stability throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431) and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term effective May 14, 2018, and ending May 14, 2020:

Dr. Tenzin Dorjee, Fullerton, California

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Next week is National Police Week, so several bills will focus on supporting the work done each day by our men and women in law enforcement. That includes H.R. 5698, the Protect and Serve Act, sponsored by Representative JOHN RUTHERFORD. This bill would make inflicting or attempting to inflict serious bodily harm on any police officer a crime punishable by up to 10 years in prison.

The House will also consider H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, sponsored by Representative Mike Conaway.

Ronald Reagan said, "American farmers are the backbone of our country," and both myself and the data would agree.

Food and ag industries drive more than 43 million jobs, over a quarter of all American jobs, and U.S. farm exports generate more than \$300 billion in economic activity.

This important bill will reauthorize farm and nutrition assistance programs for 5 years, while making reforms to modernize key programs and better support rural America.

Since my friend often asks about items beyond the week to come, I would like to make this a bonus colloquy for him, and preview several items that are possible during this work period.

This includes H.R. 5674, the VA MIS- SION Act of 2018, sponsored by Representative Phil Roe. This bill would fundamentally transform the VA and the way American veterans receive care for the better.

I want to applaud Chairman ROE for his hard work on this legislation, which recently passed his committee on a bipartisan vote of 20–2.

Next, H.R. 3, the Spending Cuts to Expired and Unnecessary Programs Act. At \$15.4 billion, the bill represents the largest single rescissions request in history.

More importantly, this bill allows Congress to give our Federal budget a much needed spring cleaning to the benefit of hardworking taxpayers.

Third, H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act, sponsored by Representative MAC THORNBERRY. This bill supports the historic investments we have made to rebuild America's

military and ensures our brave men and women have the resources they need to keep us safe.

Finally, the House may take further action on Dodd-Frank reform, including potential action on the community bank regulatory relief bill passed by the U.S. Senate.

I look forward to both Chambers taking additional policy actions in this space in the coming weeks as we continue to improve access to capital for American families and businesses.

As soon as our schedule is finalized, I will be sure to inform all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information and for the bonus of a little longer-term view of what we might be considering on the floor of the House.

One of the things I didn't hear on that, and perhaps I asked the majority leader about this before, is whether the majority is expecting to offer on the floor or consider a budget resolution this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has asked before and as we have worked time and time again, the committee is working on a budget, and as they get through, we will bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, although it was not on this list, I wonder if we might expect a budget resolution to be offered at some point in time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Even though I gave him a bonus colloquy beyond the week in front of us, that does not mean if I don't mention something, that that item would not come forward. So as the Budget Committee works, I will keep the gentleman apprised of where they are and when the timing is for us to bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Of course, April 15 is the day set forth. Many times we did not meet April 15. Clearly, last year we didn't meet April 15 by many, many months, but I appreciate the gentleman's answers.

Let me say that I will be joining Sunday night at the National Law Enforcement Memorial here in Washington, D.C., the ceremony to honor those who have given their life in service to our country as law enforcement officers. We ought to pause not just next week, but every week, to recognize the extraordinary service given to us by what I call our domestic defenders, both our police and firefighter personnel, and emergency medical response teams.

It is appropriate that we say thank you. They obviously have a very, very tough job. They get a lot of flack from time to time, but without them, we could not maintain the system of order that we have in this country that allows democracy to proceed. So I want

all of us to join, not just next week, but next week particularly, to recognize. We will have, of course, a ceremony on the west front of the Capitol.

We just had a ceremony the other day, which the Capitol Police conducted, remembering the loss of life that we experienced here in this Capitol to Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson in defending the Capitol and those who reside therein and who visit this Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, on the farm bill and on rescissions, the farm bill, as I understand it, again, I think pursuant to what the Speaker said after we passed the tax bill in which we gave 83 percent of \$1.5 trillion to the wealthiest in America, the farm bill is now trying to fill that \$1.8 trillion hole that was constructed by the tax bill by reducing benefits to those most in need in this country.

I would not so much ask a question of the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, but simply to observe that I would hope we would not try to fill that very, very deep hole that we have dug by passing that tax bill by taking it from those who are most in need.

□ 1145

I notice that, as well as the farm bill, the rescission bill was referred to by the leader as coming to the floor as well, and that seeks to cut a very substantial amount from the contingency fund for child health insurance.

The majority leader will make the point, well, that is money that is not necessarily expected to be spent. In fact, he wrote to CBO asking them a question. The CBO said they didn't think any children would be dropped off because if the contingency is not realized, no children will be dropped off. If, however, the contingency is, and there are no contingency funds available to do that, then, in fact, children will be at risk, unless we pass additional legislation.

I think it is unfortunate the majority is pursuing a policy now, both on the farm bill and on the rescission bill, that seeks to undermine the safety and security of those who are nutritionally underserved in this country.

It is amazing, in the richest country on the face of the Earth, we have people—one out of five children is going, Mr. Speaker, to bed at night hungry. We ought to be moving in the other direction.

This bill has, historically, been a very bipartisan bill. Mr. LUCAS and Mr. PETERSON, in the last reauthorization, brought a bipartisan bill to the floor. Very frankly, it was turned into a partisan bill on the floor, Mr. Speaker, when an amendment was offered and voted on by much of the leadership on the majority side, which would have cut \$40 billion from food stamps for those who are hungry Americans among us.

This is less than that, but I understand that the Heritage Action, Club for Growth, and Americans for Pros-

perity are opposed to the bill because it is not a deep enough cut, either in farm programs or in nutritional programs.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we hope that these will not be policies that we will pursue as a House of Representatives, or as a Congress, and, very frankly, we think the farm bill has little chance of passing the Senate. I would say zero, but that perhaps is a little bit too strong, but certainly little—so that we will be spinning our wheels to send an ideological message to constituencies, I suppose, that want to undercut the ability to ensure that people have food that are hungry in our country.

As to the rescission bill that the majority leader mentioned, Mr. Speaker, rescissions are pretty common. Rescissions are common and mostly done by the Congress of the United States, and we do it annually. In almost every appropriation bill that we pass, or omnibus that we pass, not so much CRs, but they have been present in CRs as well, that we have rescissions.

The Congress has also gotten, as the majority leader will point out, rescission requests from the executive department. Largely, those have been not agreed to by the Congress. Only in one instance has one President had even a majority of his requests acceded to, and that was President Clinton.

But the fact of the matter is, for the most part, rescissions have been pursued by the Congress of the United States, appropriately so, doing its job. And, of course, President Bush asked for no rescissions. President Reagan asked for a lot of rescissions, but President Bush asked for no rescissions—I refer to the second President Bush—nor did President Obama, notwithstanding when the Republicans were largely in charge of the Congress of the United States. And we exercised our judgment and did, in fact, do rescissions in the appropriations process.

Now, we have not had a budget. It is the middle of May. It is a month after the budget was to come forward. Our side does not see a budget moving, but perhaps the majority leader is correct, the committee is considering that, and that would be another place where the Congress could take initiatives and a decision to rescind various amounts of spending.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I said if there was spending that was neither necessary nor had been authorized over long periods of time, then I would have no objection, personally, to that rescission, and would think that we could initiate that action. But I would hope that, in both of these instances, we would not take actions which would adversely affect those who are challenged in America, either because of health reasons or nutritional reasons.

I would secondly say, and lastly—the majority leader, I am sure, wants to make some comments—60 percent of the budget that we passed, which our Republican friends apparently think

was too much, was defense. Not a single red cent is included in the President's rescission from the defense side of the budget, only the nondefense discretionary funding, the people part of the budget.

Now, I am a strong supporter of national security, Mr. Speaker, and I have been for the 37 years that I have been in this House. But I do not delude myself that every bit of money that has been appropriated—trillions of dollars over the last 4, 5, or 6 years—has either been spent or is not subject to, perhaps, the Congress saying, well, we put that money on the table but it hasn't been spent.

But apparently the President can't find a single red cent for that, but he can find places where we can undermine research for innovation, Children's Health Insurance Program.

I understand the leader is going to say that CBO says not a single child will be dropped. That may be true; but if we drop the contingency fund, which has been available and has been used year after year, either directly for health insurance or for related programs for children, then we will be at risk of hurting people whom I don't think anybody in this body wants to hurt. So I would hope that, before those bills are brought to the floor, we would keep those matters in consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those many questions.

I have got good news for the gentleman. If his concern is the contingency fund for the Children's Health Insurance Program, no need to fear. In the life of the entire program, the most that has ever been used, accumulated completely, is \$300 million; that is why we set aside \$500 million.

Go beyond the long history of it. CBO tells us they don't expect any of it to be used, but we want an insurance, just as we wanted this program to survive; that is why it got extended more than 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to remind my friend he voted against that. But we care about the Children's Health Insurance Program; we care about the taxpayers.

The good news is, in this rescission program, none of that money can be spent. And if you are concerned about it and worried about maybe you would make that vote, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the other side, she voted to take that same amount from CHIP in the omnibus to spend somewhere else, because you can't use the money, and we have already extended it 10 years, and no child is going to be harmed by this. CBO says it, all the way through, and we keep the contingency fund there.

But you won't rescind the money that you now have the authority to even spend on the program to give back to the taxpayers? That is what is interesting to me because I listened to you

closely, and we have had this discussion before about rescissions. It was just in our last colloquy.

I remember when we talked about rescissions because that used to be common practice. President Bill Clinton did it 111 times. President Ronald Reagan did it 214 times. And both Presidents, Mr. Speaker, had Congresses that were from other parties some time during their administration.

So when you and I talked about it, because you had voted for rescissions before, I wanted to make sure I got your input before ever talking to the administration because I would like to have your help on this. I think the American taxpayers would like to have everybody's help on this.

So I asked you in that colloquy, I was hoping that you would support this bill from our last one because you said, in our last colloquy: "I wouldn't irrationally oppose a rescission which said we've had money laying in an account that has not been spent for 1, 2, or 3 years. We shouldn't just have it sitting in that account."

Because in our colloquy, Mr. Speaker, the concern on the other side from my friend was we were going to break a trust; that we were going to take money from that omnibus that he felt a lot of people negotiated in, but, unfortunately, that trust he couldn't vote for.

You even interrupted me to say you believe that rescinding those funds was a reasonable thing to do. I agree that it is a reasonable thing to do.

So this administration, I think, may have listened to our colloquy, Mr. Speaker, because if you look at this rescission package, the largest one ever done, common practice from President Ford up until Bill Clinton, you asked for funding that has sat for the last 1, 2, or 3 years. But even in this one, we identified programs that have sat there for 7 years.

There has not been a loan in a program since 2011, and there is more than \$4 billion sitting there. Taking you at your word, you would jump at this. I should have asked you to cosponsor it.

Now, I hope all Members will put the politics aside and be able to support this because this is really what the taxpayer is looking for. This is really what this House has a history of doing.

I know you have brought up a few other issues in there, and I know, when you talk about the Children's Health Insurance Program, the CBO has said that "rescinding the unobligated balances would . . . not affect outlays, or the number of individuals with insurance coverage."

There are so many times I hear CBO quoted here, so I hope we would quote it here as well. In other words, this will have no effect on the CHIP program.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted earlier, in the omnibus, those who voted for it, and the leader on the other side did, it did the exact same thing with a higher number. So it was unobligated then and okay to do it. I am just not sure

why it wouldn't be now if you send it back to the taxpayers.

Now, I do want to, also, Mr. Speaker, know because we have worked on this CHIP program for quite some time. Now, the Republicans passed the longest and most generous CHIP extension in the program's history.

Now, for the record, my friend did vote against it, not once, not twice, but three times in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to quote an AP article from Andy Taylor, because you just can't make this stuff up.

"Just weeks ago, Democrats supported almost \$7 billion in cuts to the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, eager to grab easy budget savings to finance new spending at the Department of Health and Human Services. But some Democrats howled over the Trump proposal anyway."

Let me get this straight. Is it okay to rescind the CHIP program, Mr. Speaker, when NANCY PELOSI wants to spend more? But when President Trump wants to save the taxpayers money, with no effect on the CHIP program at all, is that what Armageddon is?

Now, I don't want to play politics, and I know you have mentioned a lot, and you did mention the tax bill, and you did mention April. There was more good news in America. It wasn't just that unemployment is at 3.9 percent. You know the last time—the whole time I have been elected in Congress—

Mr. HOYER. 2000, as I recall, when Mr. Clinton was President.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, 18 years ago. Do you know that the claims for unemployment are at the lowest point it has been in more than four decades? That is more than 40 years.

Do you know, just in the last year, 2 million more people have jobs? Did you realize the millions of people who actually got bonuses; or just in one company, 1.2 million Americans have a longer maternity leave?

□ 1200

And did you see the revenue into America's Government last month? It was the largest surplus in the history. The most revenue coming in.

So all of those colloquies we had of the fear of this tax bill, the one that allowed Americans to keep more of what they earned, the one that we promised would create more jobs, the one that would bring more prosperity, facts don't lie. America is in a very good place, and I am thankful that we had that debate.

Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, the others on the other side, there wasn't one of them who could agree with us. But I think today they can agree with the numbers of what it says and what it means; that we know for any American who has a child that is 18 years old and ready to go away to college, they don't have the fear that they are going to have to come back and live with their

parents. They are going to enter one of the strongest economies to find a job, of course, in their lifetime, but maybe almost in one of the best times we have seen in ours.

So, yes, I am excited about this. I am also excited about the idea of bringing a tradition back that saves the taxpayers money, one that, Mr. Speaker, my friend has voted for before, one that protects the CHIP program by setting aside, on a contingency basis, more than what has ever been asked for in the history of it, \$500 million when only \$300 million it has, and even though they say not one dollar would be spared. So we have the reserve there for it.

I am excited that the administration listened to our colloquy, took my friend's wisdom and advice that he would look at any accounts that sat there 1, 2, and even 7 years that was unobligated, to be able to save the taxpayer money. And I look forward to when that is on the floor so that we can vote on it together and show the American public that we are serious about saving taxpayers money.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He mentioned a number of facts.

Economically, I think all of us can be happy that unemployment is down. The gentleman then mentioned that there are less unemployment requests being made.

Is the gentleman aware that, in 2016, we created 400,000 more jobs than we created in 2017? Is the gentleman aware of that fact? That is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman realize that there are 2 million more people in the workforce in less than a year?

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman understand that more than 5 million people got a bonus that, Mr. Speaker, some people on the other side thought was crumbs?

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman understand that the 3.9 percent unemployment rate, many Americans have not seen that in almost two decades?

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman understand that we just watched last night our President at Andrews Air Force Base bring back three Americans that were held in prison in North Korea, and for the first time since that conflict has gone on there is an opportunity to end that war?

So, yes, I think some of our best days are right now; but with the potential of what we have not only with our tax bill, but, if we get our farm bill moving where we help individuals to get into that workforce, because that unemployment is so low, I do believe the best days are in front of us.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I presume the answer is the gentleman did not know that there were 400,000 more jobs

created in 2016 than were created in 2017. I didn't get the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

Let me ask, however, if the gentleman is convinced that there is not a single nickel that can be rescinded from the Defense Department budgets over the last 10 years, trillions of dollars of money, and that only the non-defense side of the budget is subject to rescissions, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman of the opinion that there are no sums available from the defense budget to try to fill the \$1.8 trillion hole created by the tax bill?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I remember what the gentleman said. The gentleman is very concerned about the trust that we would have because of the months that went into the omnibus, that we would break this trust, even though those who negotiated, still some did not vote for it. But in that omnibus, because defense had been cut more than 20 percent, because when I wake up this morning and I see rockets flying from Syria into Israel, when we watch the world become unsafe, it is not 20 percent safer. We made an investment into military.

The gentleman does not want any cuts to go into that process, but my question to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is there any cut in the rescission the gentleman supports, because I took him at his word.

I said to the administration: I just had a great conversation in a colloquy that the gentleman on the other side said of course he would look at anything that was 1, 2, 3, or further years that was unobligated.

That is the only thing that is in the rescission. The easiest way not to save taxpayers money is to find something that is not in the bill that you just really need.

The gentleman laid out in a colloquy what he wanted in a rescission. It did not deal with the omnibus because the gentleman is worried about the trust. The gentleman said he would look at anything from 1, 2, 3, or further. That is the only thing in here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend: Is there anything in the rescission bill that he could support by giving the taxpayers more money back?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, of course the answer to that question is yes.

Mr. Speaker, as I have explained to the majority leader, the Congress has rescinded billions of dollars through the years, and I have voted for rescissions that have been sent down by Presidents of the United States, and there may well be rescissions that are sent down that I could support.

I do not intend to support rescissions, Mr. Speaker, that I view as undermining children's health. I know what the majority leader says: nobody is going to be hurt.

Now, interestingly enough, in that answer, he does not answer my ques-

tion except we all want a strong defense. Nobody on this floor has longer supported Israel's right to be safe and defended than I have.

The issue is I asked the majority leader this does not include a single red cent of rescissions from the trillions of dollars to the Defense Department, not because I want to undermine the Defense Department any more than he says he wants to undermine children's health, but this is not about rescissions, per se. What it is about is the flack that the majority party is getting, that the President is getting from the Club for Growth, from Heritage Action, from Americans for Prosperity, saying: Your budget was too big. The omnibus was too big. We don't like it. Show some fiscal discipline.

So in an effort to show fiscal discipline, who do they go after? The Children's Health Insurance Program.

He can say it all he wants, but he well knows, and the appropriators will tell him, Mr. Speaker, that that money has been used on an ongoing basis by the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee and by the Appropriations Committee to backfill in places where there were clearly shortages on services to children and families.

The gentleman may want to say whether or not he believes—because outlays are not affected, he says—that, in fact, this rescission will lower the nondefense discretionary baseline in 2019. That is what I think the real purpose is, Mr. Speaker, and that is why the majority leader has not answered the question about whether there is a single cent to save the taxpayer money—we all want to save the taxpayer money—out of the Defense Department side of the budget or whether that is simply sacrosanct and not worthy of oversight by the Congress or by the President.

That was my question. It was not answered, and I regret that.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has any idea, because I know he has served on the Appropriations Committee, please offer up, like any Member can, what he would cut or what he wants to find as savings. I will look in any department anywhere to find a savings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman show me where in the CHIP program—because, one, you cannot use these funds; two, the contingency base is more than what has ever been used in the history of it—show me where the Children's Health Insurance Program, because no one is saying it. No one can show that it is. Please point it out to us.

You do not have the authority to spend this money. We put a contingency fund, set aside, and looked at the history of the program. The most that was ever used was \$300 million, so we keep \$500 million in reserve.

If the gentleman could explain to me why, then, for those who voted for the omnibus on your side of the aisle, would you make a larger, same amount, and the argument then to take that money in the omnibus but not now, why is it different?

Why is it different when the taxpayers will save money into an account you cannot spend, you don't have the legal authority to, and it is just sitting there, and it goes to the criteria of what you laid out, 1, 2, 3, or 4?

The great thing about a rescission, this doesn't have to be the only one. So if you want to work with us and you find areas that you want to find savings to the taxpayers, I will make myself available to have those meetings.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is the majority leader aware of the fact, when he says that the rescission was cut or the CHIP was cut, is the gentleman aware of where that money went when it was cut, or—I would say it in a different way—reprogrammed to other items in the omnibus or in the Labor-Health bill in previous appropriations? Is the gentleman aware of the difference between the cut and the reprogramming of money for a different objective related to the appropriation that was included?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, because if you listened to what I said earlier, it went to HHS.

But this is the point: Then the gentleman is acknowledging that you could not use that money for the CHIP program, so it is still sitting there. You do not have the authority for it. It is exactly what you said to me in a colloquy, just our last, that you will look at any account that is sitting there 1, 2, 3, all the way to 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the argument, if no child could be harmed, if the Republicans put it for 10 years, the longest it has ever been, you can't use the money, and we leave a contingency fund there.

If the gentleman wants to find a reason to get to "no," I understand that. But I am of the belief I want to find a way to save money, and I don't know what points the gentleman tries to bring up and say it is political. No.

The whole time I have been in this House, I have always held to the belief: It doesn't matter; we can find in any program waste. But this rescission program is about money that is sitting in accounts that you laid out that you said you would be more than willing to look at, and that is what we have done, and I hope you would be able to keep your word and vote for it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not answered either one of my questions, A, whether there was a single red cent available in the Defense Department for rescission, because that money has been laying there 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 years. Is there a single red cent there? B, he did not answer the question whether or not this rescission will adversely impact the discretionary baseline for the 2019 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. Did the gentleman yield to me? On what point?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I did yield to the gentleman about the single red cent, because all of this deals on the nondefense side of the budget, which is, by the way, the smallest part of the budget.

The gentleman keeps saying we need to make sure we do these cuts. He wasn't as concerned, apparently, about balancing our budget when he cut \$1.8 trillion, \$1.5 trillion—\$1.8 trillion when you include the interest. I know they say it is going to pay for itself. I have been here a long time. They have said that before. It never has paid for itself.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will not answer those two questions: Is there not a single red cent in the Defense budget; are they looking at the Defense budget to see whether or not we put money on the table that is either no longer necessary or has not been used for a significant period of time—that seems to be his rationale—or, secondly, whether or not it is going to have an adverse effect on the budget deal that was reached in terms of where the non-defense discretionary spending base will be for the 2019 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I will answer any question he has or any other reason why he finds a way you can't save taxpayers money, but let me answer your questions.

Since we don't touch FY18 funds, it does not affect FY19 baseline.

Secondly, I said earlier, the gentleman is a Member of this Congress. Rescissions do not have to be a one-time offer. If you have any ability or any ideas, I am more than willing to work with you. I am more than willing to work in the future not just on that line, but others as well.

□ 1215

Mr. HOYER. Is the gentleman aware that there are \$95 billion of unobligated funds in the Department of Defense?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is great. Will the gentleman offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the majority leader—he wants to do these rescissions. Congress usually does these. They do them in the appropriations process, and that is fine. Presidents have also done that.

My question to him was: If you want to see rescissions, and—as he has quoted me over, and over, and over again—funds that are not necessary, not needed, not going to be spent, obviously, we will consider rescissions for those.

However, what I have asked the gentleman is, you make the assessment. Very frankly, the first time we make a rescission suggestion on defense, he will stand up, or others on his side will

stand up, and say: See, they are against defense.

I am strongly for our national security, and I always have been. But I think it is perverse in the farm bill to look at people who need nutritional help. This CHIP program, if there is \$500 million as he claims, and he is probably accurate—I don't want to assess the gentleman's saying something inaccurate—but clearly, these funds have been used for other issues almost annually by the Appropriations Committee. Mr. COLE would say that. Mrs. LOWEY would say that.

I would expect, Mr. Speaker, for both the President and the majority to propose where those \$95 billion in unobligated funds might also add to his desire to make sure that taxpayers get some money back that is not being used.

I yield to my friend and then we will conclude.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman used Congressman TOM COLE's name, saying that he would say something. Congressman TOM COLE is a cosponsor of the rescission bill.

He is an appropriator, just as Congresswoman KAY GRANGER, Congressman TOM GRAVES. They are all on the Appropriations Committee, and they are all cosponsors of this bill because they want to continue to look to ways that you can save taxpayers money.

I know we have gone around and around here. The question really ends to a philosophy. Can we find a place that we can save the taxpayers money, or can we only find the time that we will take that money when you can't spend it and spend it someplace else? I believe we could take money that you cannot spend and give it back to the taxpayer.

The gentleman brings up other areas. My door is open. I don't want this to be the only rescission. I look for any department, any area in government that we could find savings that are left over, that are sitting there. Or let's make it more accountable. Let's find savings in the current process as well. I am all for that.

But the one thing, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to is voting "no." That is the easiest thing to do on this floor. I can always find a reason why I am against a bill because something else was not in it.

What is in this bill today is what my friend said in the last colloquy. His argument against having a rescission package was all based upon the omnibus. So he laid this out. Then we meet that criteria, and then he is going to lay another reason out.

You cannot point to anywhere, CBO or any other place, where it states that the CHIP program is harmed. I am sure he was concerned about that, Mr. Speaker, when he voted against it three times, when he extended for 10 years.

This isn't about CHIP. It has nothing to do with it, because the CBO says it is all protected. We put a contingency

fund in there greater than what was ever used in the history of the program.

Mr. Speaker, what the real story here is: Can you take money and give it back to the taxpayers and save money, or do you always have to spend more in Washington? I think when the bill comes to the floor, the American people will get that answer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has mentioned numerous times that I voted against some of the bills that were offered on this floor, and he is right. He tries to make it as if I voted against the CHIP program. He knows that is not an honest representation, Mr. Speaker, any more than the chairman of the Armed Services Committee voting against one of those bills with me being against defense.

I was against it, frankly, because the Speaker and the majority leader made a representation in September that we are going to solve a problem we have yet to solve. And I am sorry about that. I think it is wrong not to have solved it, and we were told we were going to have a solution to it.

But the fact of the matter is, what I am saying is, the Republicans talked and talked mightily about deficit reduction and giving money back to the taxpayer. But if you break their bank, the money is going to be taken from our children.

And so they passed a massive, \$1.5 trillion tax bill, massive, and then they come here with nickel-and-dime programs and say they are going to give money back to the taxpayer.

I am for giving money back to the taxpayer. I am not for doing it by creating additional debt for their children and their grandchildren. I think that is not only an intellectually bankrupt policy, but an immoral policy. But we are not going to resolve it today. I understand that.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman just said nickel-and-dime programs. This will be the largest rescission in the history of this country. It is not nickels and dimes. It is the taxpayers' money. If it is nickels and dimes to the taxpayers, I want to save those, just the same. But this is billions.

The gentleman tries to make an argument that doesn't hold. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman argues that CHIP could be in jeopardy. The CBO says that is not true. The press writes that it is not true. I cannot find anywhere that this program would be harmed.

I listened to my friend on the other side explain why he voted against CHIP three times. His explanation is because he said there was a promise on the other side for some other bill to come to the floor. I can take him at his word, but my only question back to him would be: Then why does he vote for any bill? Shouldn't he vote "no" on every bill that is on the floor then, if that is the protest?

I don't understand why he would take it out on the Children's Health Insurance Program. I don't understand why, when we had the opportunity and we were able to achieve it, he voted "no" to get the longest extension in a decade.

Mr. Speaker, I know the American public will see through what is politics and what is policy and what is opportunity. Yes, we did pass a tax bill and, unfortunately, it was just one side that voted for it.

Yes, our unemployment is the lowest it has been in more than 18 years. Our unemployment claims are the lowest they have been in 44 years. Two million more people are now in the workforce.

If you go back, 9, 10 years, the participation rate in America was over 65 percent. Unfortunately, just a few years ago, it got all the way down to 62.7, the lowest it has been since 1978. But the good news is, it is on its way back up.

The good news is, Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans got bonuses where they could fix their car, maybe buy that new washing machine. The better news is, Mr. Speaker, that the revenues into government are even higher—part of what the argument was on passing the tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, it was even an excitement to watch President Trump sitting at Andrews Air Force Base watching three Americans get off an airplane that have been in prison in North Korea, released on the hopes that the war and the battle of North Korea against South Korea can end, and that the President has announced that he has a location and time for that meeting.

Yes, the world looks brighter. But there are still places around the world that are not safe. And, yes, we did make an investment into the military that I am very proud of. I actually voted for that bill. People will say a lot of people negotiated. Some that negotiated didn't vote for it in the end.

So, Mr. Speaker, I try to listen to the other side and I take what they say very seriously. When I heard in our last colloquy that a rescission bill had to be made on those funds that have sat there for 1, 2, 3, and even 7 years, that is what we did. And I look forward to working on further bills in any department that anyone in this body would like to work on.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this administration will have the largest deficit increase of any administration in history. They haven't been here very long, so that is a prediction I make, and I am absolutely positive I am correct.

They are now trying to bring that down, as I have said, by going after investments on the domestic side of the budget, both in the farm bill and in the rescission package. There are clearly rescissions that are justified and that the Appropriations Committee and administrations have made on a regular basis. When administrations have made

them, almost invariably, the majority of the rescissions requested by the administrations—Democrat or Republican—have been rejected by the Congress of the United States.

But I am hopeful, as the majority leader says, that we can reach bipartisan agreement on rescissions that, in fact, make sense. I would also hope we could reach some bipartisan agreement on solving issues that confront this country.

The farm bill is a perfect example where it historically has been a bipartisan bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a partisan bill this year, as they made it the last time when Chairman LUCAS reported out a bipartisan bill and pleaded with his party not to make it a partisan bill. They made it a partisan bill and, of course, it failed in the Senate. It wasn't even brought up in the Senate. The Senate did its own bill.

So I would hope that the words of the majority leader about wanting to work in a bipartisan fashion will be realized with respect to all of these issues, including rescissions. And I would hope that we could perhaps have some rational policies to try to stem the extraordinary deficits that will inevitably be caused, as they have been in the past, by a tax cut bill that gave 83 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest in our Nation.

Without further ado, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LETTER CARRIERS' STAMP OUT HUNGER FOOD DRIVE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about an excellent event that will take place Saturday in communities throughout the Nation.

The 26th annual Letter Carriers' Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive is the country's largest single-day food drive. It is the brainchild of the National Association of Letter Carriers in response to the need they saw every day on their routes.

Letter carriers go into neighborhoods in every town at least 6 days a week, and they have a keen awareness of their neighbors in need. After receiving input from food banks and pantries, the letter carriers determined that late spring would be the best time for a food drive since by then most food banks in the country start running out of donations received during the Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday periods.

Known for its distinctive blue plastic bags, the Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive provides nonperishable food to local food banks, shelters, and meal programs across the United States.

One bag of food may seem small, but it goes a long way to stamp out hunger.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN PHIPPEN

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of John Phippen. John attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

John was the father of six and grandfather to one. His life revolved around his friends, children, and grandkids.

John showed his true character the night of the Route 91 festival when he died while shielding a stranger with his body from the gunfire.

John was a kind and gentle man who enjoyed the simple things in life. His favorite thing to do was spend time with his family and friends in the sand dunes at Lake Havasu or camping at the beach. Everyone who knew John remembers him for being a wonderful, selfless, and sweet man.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to John Phippen's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

□ 1230

A-29 SUPER TUCANO SUCCESS IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. RUTHERFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the success of the A-29 Super Tucano light-attack combat aircraft in Afghanistan, a joint U.S. Air Force, NATO, and Afghan Air Force program.

Starting in December of 2015, the 81st Fighter Squadron at Moody Air Force Base graduated the first class of Afghan A-29 pilots, and this April marked the 2-year anniversary of these pilots' first combat mission in Afghanistan, a remarkable milestone.

As one U.S. Armed Forces commander stated: The A-29 combat mission in Afghanistan has been a game changer. The program's success has drawn the attention of our allies with more than 14 air forces using the A-29 and over 320,000 flight hours and 40,000 combat hours. Even our own Air Force is currently conducting experimentation on adding this light-attack aircraft to the fleet.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this contribution in part because, since 2011, the A-29 has been built in my district in Jacksonville, Florida, by a team of more than 1,000 U.S. employees, 60 percent of which, Mr. Speaker, are veterans. The A-29 is truly made in America and includes the support of more than 100 suppliers and subcontractors across 20 States.

BIDDING FAREWELL TO CHARLIE DENT

(Ms. SÁNCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, very shortly we will be losing a Member of the House of Representatives. CHARLIE DENT, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will be leaving this body. I would be remiss if I didn't come to the floor and talk about his tremendous service to the House of Representatives.

I had the honor and the privilege of serving with Mr. DENT on the Ethics Committee. Not that serving on the Ethics Committee is a great honor or a great privilege, but serving with him truly was. He is a man of integrity, a man who kept his word, a man who worked hard to get through the business at hand, somebody whom I could trust, and somebody with a really great sense of humor, which, in this body, is becoming a rarer and rarer thing.

He is truly a likeable individual, somebody who took his job and his responsibilities seriously. And I want to wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors, and I want him to know that he will be sorely missed in this body.

HONORING MAYOR JAMES FULLER

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. James F. Fuller, Sr., the longtime mayor of Ludowici in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Mayor Fuller worked in every area possible to serve the people of Ludowici. He began working for Ludowici as a police officer, then police chief, then finally water superintendent. Forty-two years ago, Mayor Fuller was elected to his first term on city council. When he passed, he was completing his second term as the city's mayor. Not only did he lend his hand to Ludowici but also to our Nation as a whole, serving in the Navy during the Korean war.

A true public servant, Mayor Fuller was fulfilling his pledge as the city's leading official up until the very last moments before his passing. Even in the hospital, he said he would never get tired of talking about Ludowici and doing what he can for the people there. Mayor Fuller passed away on April 27 at the age of 83. His family, friends, and the city of Ludowici are in my thoughts and prayers.

REMEMBERING PATTY BIRKHOLZ

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a friend and former colleague, former State Senator Patty Birkholz. I join my colleagues and

friends in Lansing today by wearing purple in her honor, as she was affectionately known as Purple Patty. Literally down to the ink pens that she used, everything was purple.

Senator Birkholz was first elected to the State legislature in 1996, as the first woman from Allegan County in the western side of Michigan. Then she became the first female Republican speaker pro tempore. After that she was elected to the State senate, where she served two terms.

Upon leaving the legislature, Senator Birkholz was appointed director of the Office of the Great Lakes by Governor Rick Snyder and as the Michigan representative to the Great Lakes Commission. President Barack Obama appointed Senator Birkholz to the National Sea Grant Advisory Board, a position she continued until she passed away.

Senator Birkholz was a passionate advocate for Michigan's natural resources and passed significant legislation, creating the Great Lakes Interbasin Compact, water withdrawal assessment laws, and ballast water standards that have affected all of the Great Lakes region. In 2010, a 291-acre portion of the 1,000-acre Saugatuck Dunes State Park was renamed the "Patricia Birkholz Natural Area" by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment.

She was a friend and a colleague who fought hard for her beliefs. She was tough, she was compassionate, and she was a great legislator. She will be deeply missed. Blessings to her family as we mourn her loss.

FREED AMERICANS IN NORTH KOREA

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a big welcome home to the three Americans who arrived early this morning back in the United States, in their words, the greatest Nation in the world, following their captivity in North Korea.

I commend Secretary of State Pompeo for his work to secure the release of these Americans and to President Trump for resetting the negotiating dynamic that led to this day. If we were following the prior administration's strategic patience, they would still be imprisoned.

With the freeing of these Americans and the other recent developments on the Korean Peninsula, including what is reflected in this photo, both North and South Korea removing their respective propaganda speakers from the DMZ, one cannot help but recall the events of 1989, in Eastern Europe, and the thaw that resulted in the freeing of half a continent.

Today's homecoming is a positive step in achieving lasting peace, but we still have a long way to go. It is a

shame that this could not have come to fruition in time for Otto Warmbier's safe release.

Let us hope that, with the forthcoming talks between the United States and North Korea, much more progress will be made.

GODSPEED, CHARLIE DENT

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today we say farewell to a colleague and good friend, CHARLIE DENT, a dedicated public servant who served in the Pennsylvania House for 8 years, the Pennsylvania Senate for 6, and 14 years in the United States Congress.

Again, a dedicated public servant. He is smart. He is tough. He is hard-working. He has a great sense of humor. But, most importantly, he has been a voice of reason here in the House of Representatives. He has worked extremely hard to represent the people of the 15th District over those past 14 years and done it with great honor and integrity.

As Charlie leaves the House today, I say to my good friend: Chuck, we are going to miss you. Godspeed.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-123)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, with respect to the Central African Republic, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2018.

The situation in and in relation to the Central African Republic, which has been marked by a breakdown of law and order, intersectarian tension, widespread violence and atrocities, and the pervasive, often forced recruitment and use of child soldiers, threatens the peace, security, or stability of the Central African Republic and the neighboring states, and continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to

the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic declared in Executive Order 13667.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 10, 2018.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 11, 2018, TO TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2018

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 15, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. ON FRIDAY, MAY 11, 2018, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until 6 p.m. on Friday, May 11, 2018, to file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FAREWELL TO THE CONGRESS AND THANK YOU TO MY CONSTITUENTS IN THE 15TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give notice of my intent to resign from the United States House of Representatives on May 12 and to share a few words with my fellow Members and the American people.

It has truly been an honor and privilege to serve the people of Pennsylvania's 15th District, and I am proud of my time in Congress. I believe that I have made a difference and improved the lives of the constituents whom I have served in Pennsylvania: from serving on the House Homeland Security Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, which is being very ably led by my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER)—and his term is also coming to

its end. I want to commend him and congratulate him on his dedicated service all these years—and to my current role as a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, chairing the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies; and as past chairman of the House Ethics Committee.

And I was delighted for my good friend LINDA SÁNCHEZ, who just spoke a few moments ago, serving with her. She was a wonderful partner on that committee. So much of the staff, some of whom are here in the Chamber today, I was so thrilled to be able to have that opportunity to work with her and the staff, who are all so professional.

I also had the opportunity to serve as co-chair of the Tuesday Group Caucus. I was very pleased with what we were able to accomplish in that role. And as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, I fought to fulfill the basic functions of government, like keeping the government funded and preventing default on our Nation's obligations. At times, that has not been easy.

I see my good friend Mr. COLE is here, too. He has been a great appropriator, a great leader, and a great mentor to me.

Unfortunately, due to disruptive political influences, increased polarization has led the Congress to becoming more paralyzed and unable to perform even our most basic and fundamental tasks. This phenomenon manifested itself most clearly during the 2013 Federal Government shutdown, but it continues today.

This political polarization has led to a disturbing trend where fringe elements of both the far right and far left are emboldened and empowered. And while the bases of both political parties are well represented in Congress, the governing center has been under increased pressure.

Too many Republicans expect unquestioning—blind, unquestioning—loyalty and obedience to President Trump, no matter how absurd or disruptive the comment or behavior. Constitutional separation of powers is almost an alien concept, after relentlessly demanding Congress assert its Article I powers during the Obama years.

On the other side, far too many Democrats offer unflinching resistance and opposition to President Trump, even if they agree with him on a given policy or position.

Separation of political parties has replaced separation of powers as a guiding, governing philosophy. This dynamic is simply not sustainable, and it is already having troubling consequences.

We have already seen a rise in the three-headed monster of isolationism, protectionism, and nativism. These are not qualities of a great nation. In fact, they dishonor the sacrifices and service of the Greatest Generation, who delivered both victory during World War II

and the farsighted, outward-looking, post-war, rules-based order that has brought unprecedented freedom and prosperity to America and its friends, allies, and partners.

Furthermore, traditional democratic values—the rule of law, freedom of press, an independent judiciary—are under unprecedented attack throughout much of the world.

□ 1245

It is incumbent upon all of us to stand up and defend our way of life and our institutions. In Congress, we need to reestablish a strong, bipartisan governing center that will help restore order and stability to Washington and that will also help alleviate a lot of concerns throughout the country.

To be sure, there are a number of Members working towards that goal: the members of the Tuesday Group, Republican Main Street Partnership, the Blue Dogs, New Democrats, Problem Solvers Caucus, and there are others. Many of these Members understand that consensus and compromise are not capitulation or surrender but, instead, are essential to a functioning republic.

We need to pursue real fiscal reform, both on the mandatory side and the revenue side of the ledger. We need a Simpson-Bowles 2.0, with teeth; and reforms must be bipartisan to ensure they are both durable and sustainable, which we know won't happen on a partisan basis.

Additionally, we need to address other challenges, such as how to increase access to and affordability for our Nation's healthcare system, expanding educational opportunities for our children and our grandchildren, and making needed improvements to our infrastructure like so many around here are dedicated to, especially my friend Chairman SHUSTER.

The administration must realize that America has to honor its agreements if we ever hope to enter into new ones. We simply cannot walk away from American commitments, even ones we may have voted against or disagreed with, if we expect to continue to build new coalitions and enter into new agreements.

Instead, we should double down on the multilateral rules-based order, whatever the flaws, that America worked so hard to establish after World War II by defending the institutions, alliances, and partnerships we established or helped establish: NATO, European unity, and, yes, a global trade regime through which we have advanced America's economic, security, and strategic interests.

We should look at ways to open new markets and expand new opportunities that unleash the power and benefits of the American free enterprise system. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, need to work together to move America forward as friends and partners who share values, ideals, and common interests.

Whether confronting a revanchist, aggressive Russia; a terrorist, theo-

cratic Iranian regime; or China's mercantilist policies, success can only be achieved by finding strength in unity.

And while I may be leaving the Halls of Congress, I am not retreating from the battlefield. Some of you may regret that. I intend to continue aggressively advocating for people and the policies of the sensible center. I hope to provide an even larger voice in favor of responsible governance and hope to foster a strong center-right movement that embraces traditional conservative virtues of order, discipline, stability, measured statements, and incremental change—not the incendiary rhetoric, chaos, and dysfunction that we have, unfortunately, grown accustomed to in recent years. Although my time in Congress is drawing to a close, I know that our Nation's future is bright.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to all my friends and colleagues, again, some of whom are here today. I thank them all, my friends and colleagues not only here in the House, but also in the Senate, for their support, their guidance, their wisdom, and their friendship over the years. It is truly very meaningful to me, and I have been especially touched by some of the very nice things people have said and other tributes that have been paid to me.

My wife said, after she heard a few of them, she is kind of waiting to meet this guy that they are all talking about. But seriously, I can't thank you enough.

I also want to give a special thank-you to all my staff, both past and present, for everything that they have done dutifully to serve our constituents in Pennsylvania and to my legislative and policy priorities.

I should note, some of my staff are seated up in the gallery, past and present. I am not supposed to do that, but, hell, it is my last day, so I can do that.

I just want to again thank the staff for their dedication and work, both my Washington and my district staff, who do a lot of work not just for me, but all of our staffs. They do a lot, and sometimes they take a lot of grief, and we don't say thank you enough to them. But the bottom line is we could have never achieved as much as we did without their dedication and their commitment.

And above all, thank you to the people of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District for the trust they have shown in me time and again. I have always said I don't know how many constituents would allow their Member the amount of latitude they have given me to be somewhat of an independent voice here and say what I felt needed to be said. I really appreciated my constituents allowing me to do that. I recognize in some districts that might not be case, so to them I say thank you again. After my family, representing them and carrying their voice to Washington has been the honor and joy of a lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I say thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

A TRIBUTE TO SEAN PATRICK MURPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESTES of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the House is often described as a family, but it is a lot bigger than 435 Members. Our extended family, of course, includes the staff of the House and the staff of each and every Member; the Capitol Police who do such an extraordinary job of protecting all of us; the maintenance crews that make sure the facilities function, are open to the public; and, frankly, all those others who make the House of Representatives a very special place.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to report what many of you already know, the loss of a member of that extended family, my longtime chief of staff, Sean Patrick Murphy.

Sean has been a professional associate and friend of mine for 19 years. He was my chief of staff for 11 years, and, frankly, we both believed he would be the last chief of staff I would ever have.

Sean Patrick Murphy left us, unexpectedly, in February. He had based his life on three things: his faith, his family, and his friends.

Those people who were privileged to know Sean know that he was a very devout Catholic, and his faith was not something that was casual to him. It was something that he lived each and every day and carried out in each and every relationship that he had.

Nothing was more important after his faith than his family. Sean Murphy was the consummate husband and father. He loved his family, and he lived a life of total dedication to them.

His wife, Johannah, and his sons, Patrick, Peter, and Charlie, were fixtures that we all heard about in our office each and every day, particularly the boys because there would always be a funny story about what they happened to be doing at any given moment. Sean worked hard so Johannah could stay home and actually homeschool those three children, so they were an extraordinarily close group.

And, finally, there were Sean's friends. No one had more, no one, frankly, held his friends longer, and no one treasured them more than Sean. Because of that, if you happened to attend his funeral, you saw over 2,000 family and friends show up to remember this extraordinary man.

As a person, Sean had all the wit, all the wisdom, all the decency of the Irish. He was a natural leader and a loyal colleague. People followed him because they trusted him. He was fair. He was decent. He was selfless. He always put others first.

And if you sent spent a day with Sean Murphy, you were going to laugh. He made people laugh partly by laughing at himself. In all the years that I

knew him and all the many capacities we dealt in together, I never had one other person come and complain to me about Sean—no constituent, no fellow staff member, no lobbyist, no member of another office. All of them thought they were his best friend.

Now, he was pretty good at that and would give you a pretty good opinion later about whether they were really a friend or not, but the point is everybody that knew him liked him, and everybody believed that he liked them back.

Sean's lifelong profession, and, really, it began when he was quite young, was his passion for politics. He took it first as a volunteer, and then it did become the manner in which he lived his life.

Now, his gentle nature hid an extraordinarily competitive personal spirit. Politics, I like to say, is an adult team sport, and Sean played it exceptionally well. He was astute in his judgment about people and about politics.

In all the many issues we discussed over many years, both in terms of dealing with political campaigns and dealing with the politics of the House, itself, both on the floor and in our Conference, I never got a piece of bad advice from Sean. But with Sean, politics always had a purpose, and that purpose was always to achieve some greater good, some more important goal.

He wasn't just good at winning; he was good at governing. He, frankly, never sold out. He had plenty of opportunities to go and make a lot more money than I could have ever paid him, but he worked for principle. He always put his country and his party and people above anything that might benefit himself. And he believed in the things that he worked for, and he worked to make a difference in this country each and every day.

Frankly, he cherished this institution above all else. He enjoyed not only the politics, but those rare moments of drama when great things happen on the floor of the House; and he made sure that any Member he worked for—and I wasn't the only one—had an opportunity to impact those events thanks to his good advice, thanks to the wonderful staff that he built and created, and thanks to his shrewd strategy.

All of us that knew him believed that he left us far too soon, but that is pretty presumptive, Mr. Speaker. Who are any of us to say something like that? God chooses the time that we come and the time that we go. How can you be bitter when your friend went to his bed, innocent and untroubled, and woke up in Heaven with our Lord and Savior?

But God does allow us to miss him, and miss him we all will. He will be missed as a husband and a father and a friend. He blessed all of us with his life. And for me, in particular, Mr. Speaker, I will miss him for all my days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

CALIFORNIA'S WATER SUPPLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a few moments ago a colleague of ours, Congressman CHARLIE DENT, who has served with great distinction and honor, a classmate of mine.

I simply want to say that he is a role model for all of us in terms of how to legislate in a thoughtful and deliberative fashion, and to reach across the aisle in a way that I think is conducive to getting things done. He certainly is a great example of how we should all reflect in terms of our work here every day.

We will miss him, and we wish him the best of luck in his next endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk about the challenges that we face in California as it relates to our water needs.

The San Joaquin Valley, that I have the honor and privilege to represent, is one of the largest agriculture regions in the entire country, and, therefore, the world. We grow half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables, 70 percent of the world's almonds, 50 percent of the world's pistachios, the number one dairy State in the Nation, and the number one citrus State in the Nation.

The list goes on and on and on, over 300 commodities that we have the ability to grow because of an incredible Mediterranean climate, and water, which is the crucible, because we like to say in the Valley that: Where water flows, food grows.

Clearly, the ability to have water reliability is so essential to ensuring that we can continue to maintain our agricultural production, which every night puts food on America's dinner table and, therefore, allows American consumers to have the healthiest, the best, nutritious quality of varieties of food and food products at the most economical cost to them and their families anywhere in the world.

We are so good at it, in producing food, not only in California, but around the country, American agriculture, that I think sometimes Americans take it for granted, because less than 3 percent of our Nation's population—as in California, less than 3 percent of our State's population—is directly involved in the production of food and fiber.

I sometimes feel that the majority of Americans believe that their food comes from a grocery store. Well, it doesn't. I mean, you get it at the grocery store, or you get it at your favorite restaurants, wherever that may be.

But before that food gets to the grocery store, or before it gets to those restaurants, it comes from farmers and ranchers and dairymen and -women across this great land of ours, and certainly California plays a key role.

We have had difficult, difficult drought periods in California. We had a 6-year prolonged drought that reminded us that the climate continues to change. What impacts we, as people, have on the change of that climate is debated. But clearly we know that we have an impact, and it continues to change.

Therefore, to be responsible, we have to plan to ensure that we have adequate water supplies to maintain our agricultural production, for it is the sustenance of life: water. Where water flows, food grows.

It is so important, obviously, throughout the country, but critical in maintaining our incredible cornucopia of agricultural production in California. You should understand that 99 percent of our agriculture in California is irrigated.

I have, for over 30 years, worked to strengthen the water reliability, not only in the San Joaquin Valley, but throughout California.

In a State like California, where we have so many resources and so many cutting-edge technologies, in terms of efficient irrigation methodologies, drip irrigation and conserving and trying to figure out ways in which we can recharge our aquifers, we are using all of the water tools in the water toolbox.

When I was in the California Legislature, I authored legislation to create the Kern County Water Bank. I led two successful water bond measures that provided more than \$2 billion to improve California's water system and provide for safe, reliable water drinking.

We have places in California, and other parts of the country, where our groundwater has gotten contaminated. Therefore, we need to make adjustments to make sure that every American—every Californian—has clean drinking water.

In Congress, I have secured approval for the Madera Irrigation District Water Bank, the San Luis Intertie, and the North Valley Regional Recycled Water Project, bringing hundreds and thousands of acre-feet to secure more water, a more reliable supply of water, for the San Joaquin Valley, but also for other parts of California, as well.

If we cannot solve the water problems in California, I really am very concerned about the future of our Nation and our planet. Again, we don't think about it, but food is a national security issue. It truly is. We take it for granted.

We not only have the ability throughout the country, and in California, to produce enough food for every American, but we produce more than we can consume and, therefore, we export many of our food products throughout the world.

But again, with the impacts of climate change, oceans rising, the planet that 2 years ago clicked 7 billion people, by the middle of the century will have 9 billion people.

Guess what happens when you add 2 billion more people to the planet? You

have to feed them. Therefore, food not only for America, but for the world, is a national security issue.

But you can't have that abundant supply of food, that reliable supply of food, unless you have a reliable supply of water.

Let me give you some perspective. Two hundred years ago, we had 1.7 billion people on the planet. So, in 200 years, we have gone from 1.7 billion to 7 billion, and by the middle of the century it is estimated that there will be 9 billion people on the planet that, yes, will need food. Only if we have reliable water supplies can we ensure that we have that reliable supply of food.

If we can't figure out ways in which to manage our water resources in California—the fifth-largest economy now in the world, a cutting-edge State in technology—if we can't solve our water problems in California, I am truly concerned about other parts of the world that depend upon reliable water supplies to feed their population.

Throughout the years that I have been both here and in Sacramento, I have worked on a bipartisan basis to pass water infrastructure improvements for our Nation. The WIIN Act, that we passed some 2 years ago, was signed into law in December of 2016.

It was part of an overall effort to provide solutions, using all the water tools in our water toolbox, that will make it more flexible to move water through California's system of waterways—the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta System—in which we can have the flexibility, but still try to deal with the environmental concerns and maintain water quality for our cities, but also provide water for our farmers.

In addition to that, provide to the State over \$355 million for water infrastructure projects, including matching Federal funds for new surface storage in California: for the Temperance Flat project, for raising the San Luis Reservoir, for creating the Sites Reservoir, and for other important funding purposes in which a Federal authorization will allow us to match both State and local dollars.

In all of my time in working to improve the lives of the people of the Valley that I have the honor and privilege to represent, rarely have I been presented with a project that has such obvious potential as the New Exchequer Dam that was built a number of years ago.

The water that is currently impounded—actually, it is a dam that was built in the twenties and expanded in the late fifties—provides irrigation for an incredible amount of productive ag land in Merced County. It also allows for groundwater replenishment in many of the nearby communities, and it also provides environmental benefits for fisheries and wildlife refuges downstream from the dam.

Recently, the Merced Irrigation District performed a detailed analysis of the hydrology of the watershed upstream from Exchequer Dam, which is

the mountains that California has been blessed with—the incredible Sierra Nevada mountain range, over 600 miles in length, 150 miles in width, and mountains that go from 12,000 feet to 14,000 feet—that provides the snowpack for California. It is Mother Nature's icebox for California.

For those of you who are not from California, you should understand that we get all of our moisture in California from November to March. Above 4,000 feet or 5,000 feet, that rain turns to snow. Then, in the springtime, it melts. It comes down, and it fills our rivers and the reservoirs that we have on our rivers, and it allows us to have a supply of water throughout the summer. We don't have any rain in the summer.

Recently, this project, as an example, it was determined by the district, the Merced Irrigation District, that if we raised the spillway gates by 8 feet, that Lake McClure, behind this dam, could add an additional 57,000 acre-feet of water.

Fifty-seven thousand acre-feet of water is a good additional supply, without impeding Merced's wild and scenic river designation. We maintain that. But, at the same time, we add 57,000 acre-feet of water to the supply. That is important.

However, to move forward with raising these spillway gates, the flood control and operations manual for Exchequer Dam must be updated, and that is the responsibility of the Army Corps of Engineers.

You should understand that many of these water projects in California, and other States across the country, have multiple purposes. They not only supply water for people, they not only try to benefit the environment, but they also provide water for farmers. At the same time, many of these projects provide hydroelectric power, and they provide flood control protection.

So, in this case, when you increase the spillway gates 8 feet, the Army Corps of Engineers has to modify the flood control manual so that when we have heavy storms and rains, as we did a year ago in California, we are able to operate the facility in such a way that also provides flood control protection.

Unfortunately, the current manual that is in place was from 1959, when the dam was expanded the second time. Army Corps of Engineers policy requires that flood control manuals be updated, therefore, to reflect the new data and the changes to a project that would occur as a result of raising these gates.

In 2017, the Merced Irrigation District wrote the Army Corps of Engineers, requesting a revision of the flood control manual. That is what this legislation that we are introducing will work on. The Army Corps indicated that they could not update the manual at the time, citing budgetary constraints.

The Merced Irrigation District proposed to pay for the public process to

update the flood control manual, to incorporate this new hydrological data, if, in fact, the gates were raised.

The Army Corps responded by saying that it didn't have the legal authority to accept funds for the purpose of a non-Federal Section 7 like this New Exchequer Dam, despite being able to do so for other Army Corps facilities.

Thus, the Non-Federal Reservoir Operations Improvement Act legislation that I have introduced would resolve this disparity by allowing the owners of a non-Federal reservoir, in this case, the Merced Irrigation District, that are regulated by the Army Corps to provide protection for flood control, to contribute the funds so that we can update the manual, so that we can, in fact, raise the gates 8 feet, which the Merced Irrigation District is going to pay for, along with their water users—that is how they pay for it—as well as paying the Army Corps of Engineers to update the flood control manual.

□ 1315

Now, this sounds like a lot of common sense, doesn't it? I think so. So that is the purpose of this legislation.

It is part of a long effort that I have been engaged in to improve the water supply, the water reliability, the water quality, the environmental benefits for the challenges that we face in California as it relates to maintaining the water needs for a State that has 40 million people, the fifth largest economy in the country, the number one agricultural State in the Nation.

So we know that with the growing demands, the competing demands on water, that crucible, the critical, absolute must resource to ensure that we can survive as people, so that where water flows, food will grow, that we can maintain the ability as a national security issue to ensure that all Americans have the kind of sustainable, good, quality, nutritious food that is so critical to our diet and to our well-being, that is really what this is all about.

This is a local project, but it is a part of a much larger effort that I have been engaged in with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to address the needs, the long-term needs of California's water supply. That is what is at the heart here.

So we will continue to work together. I hope that this legislation will be enacted this year so that the Merced Irrigation District can be able to go ahead and plan and construct the increase of water supply for the needs of the people of Merced County and the surrounding area that will have a multitude of benefits.

This is a part of an overall effort that I will continue to be engaged in in Merced County, in Madera County, and in Fresno County, throughout our valley and throughout our State to ensure that, in the long term, in the 21st century, we can count on the fact that we have a long-term water supply for all Californians that will allow us to continue to maintain our agricultural

economy and, at the same time, provide water for people who live in the cities, improve our water quality, and ensure, at the same time, that we protect the environment.

Those are the goals. It is complicated; it is complex; and it is never easy.

Mark Twain supposedly was credited, over 100 years ago, with saying, having spent some time in the West, that it was clear to him that, when we talk about water and water resources and the incredible demands on those water resources, 100 years ago, supposedly Mark Twain said that, in the West, it was clear to him, "whiskey was made for drinking and water was made for fighting."

We hope that we won't fight over our water resources but that we will work together on a bipartisan basis to solve these problems. That is what we are sent here to do: to work together on a bipartisan basis to solve a whole host of issues that we deal with. But it is very important that we focus, in this instance, on this legislation by passing a bill that makes a great deal of common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an important day for people who knew and loved the three individuals who were being held improperly by North Korea. They have now been released due to the negotiations with our prior colleague Mike Pompeo—our, now, Secretary of State—and also President Trump.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, for those who have not spent a lot of time studying American history, they have not realized what a benefit it can be to have an American President who is deemed to be a person who cannot be properly accounted for. His actions may be of interest to foreign leaders.

Frankly, I enjoy hearing people in other countries say they are just not sure what to make of President Trump. They are not sure if he is crazy; they are not sure if he might push the button to launch missiles; they are just—he is so unpredictable. But, actually, I think he is very predictable. The man knows how to negotiate.

As I pointed out to him a couple of times, if you look through our history, people who were considered to be the most educated, some said the highest intellect, greatest intellectual ability—you have people like John Quincy Adams, who is a hero of mine because of his dedication to bringing an end to slavery. It didn't happen during his 4 years of being President. It didn't happen during his 16, 17 years in the House of Representatives, but he was so dedicated to his purpose that he materially

affected the young freshmen who sat at the back of the room for 2 years, overlapping about a year with Adams before his fatal stroke on the House floor just down the hall.

John Quincy Adams, when he was President, for all his education, intellectual ability, I mean, the man wrote books in German, loved the French language, read books in other languages like French and German, probably kept the best journal of anyone who was ever elected President, but he really didn't accomplish much of anything at all when he was President. Some of that had to do with the election controversy surrounding that.

Look at people like Woodrow Wilson, a former college president, supposedly high intellectual ability, but, yes, he did get us involved in World War I. He drug his feet. There were things that could have been done, but nobody had any concern worldwide for Woodrow Wilson. He was considered very predictable, and it got us into some trouble because people didn't think he had the nerve to stand up when it was needed.

Jimmy Carter was touted as being some sort of nuclear engineer, went to the Naval Academy, but the fiascos in which he was involved as President showed a man who was a nice man but rather inept when it came to foreign affairs. Obviously, the Iranians had no fear of him. He had such poor judgment that he encouraged the removal of the Shah of Iran. Not a nice man, but he was an ally. And Carter didn't have the foresight to see, kind of like President Obama when he was dealing with Qadhafi—Obama with Qadhafi, Carter with the Shah of Iran, they figure: Well, he is not a nice guy, so we will run him off. We will encourage him being run off.

In the case of Qadhafi, if it weren't for Obama's planes and the missions to take out those defending Qadhafi, Qadhafi would probably still be in charge in Libya, and ISIS and al-Qaida elements would not have gained the incredible foothold they have had. There wouldn't be the chaos there is today in Libya.

President Obama was touted as being of high intellectual capacity, yet just one fiasco after another when it came to foreign affairs as we have seen in the news recently, President Obama's efforts to get \$100 billion to \$150 billion, some of it on pallets with just cash, American dollars on pallets with forklifts, moving those from the United States into the hands of the Ayatollah Khamenei and his bloodthirsty religious zealots in Iran, the biggest supporter of terrorism in the world. So deemed to be an intellectual President Obama was, and yet just incredible malfeasance when it came to foreign relations. People were not afraid of him.

It was interesting to see polls, while President Obama was our Chief Executive Officer, showing that, although nations where Muslims were the majority, they didn't have much respect for

President George W. Bush, but there were polls indicating that they had even less respect for President Obama.

How could that be?

They didn't see him as being very decisive. Indicative of that was, when he drew a line in the sand, had a red line, and Syria crossed that line, he did nothing about it, in essence. So that encouraged our enemies.

I know there are those who said that things that happened at Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, other places, actually hurt America badly because it inflamed our enemies, whereas, actually, nothing inspires our enemies like the showing of weakness. As President Reagan once said:

Of all the wars that occurred during my lifetime in which America was involved, none of them occurred because America was too strong.

So when other nations perceive weakness, it is provocative, and that is what has happened in our 200-plus-year history. If we are perceived as being weak, it is provocative.

President Obama oversaw a number of such weak, provocative incidents. Some weren't weak, they were just foolish, like encouraging the taking out of Qadhafi. He was not a good man, had blood on his hands from back in the 1980s, and yet when President George W. Bush sent troops into Iraq, Qadhafi had an epiphany and invited us to come in and tell him what weapons he could keep and what he had to get rid of because he was afraid that he would be the next nation to be invaded.

When it comes to North Korea, President Clinton, educated in what are considered by some to be quite elite schools, Ivy League schools, and yet he oversaw, as President, negotiations with North Korea. This is just a rather short summary, but basically Madeleine Albright as Secretary of State and President Clinton's approach to North Korea was: Look, we will make sure that you get all the nuclear material you need to make nuclear weapons; we will make sure you get all the technology you need to create nuclear weapons.

□ 1330

We will get you in a better situation as far as the ability to have nukes than you could ever have possibly done on your own. And all we ask in return, in essence, is you sign a document saying that you won't use the technology and the materials to make nuclear weapons.

I can just envision the glee, the celebrations behind the scenes in North Korea over how crazy and foolish American leaders are, during the Clinton administration, because they are going to give us everything we need to have nuclear weapons, and all we have got to do is put a signature on a document.

Then we saw history repeat itself when John Kerry played the role of Madeleine Albright, this time with Iran; and, of course, we did have

Wendy, who was so helpful in getting North Korea what they needed to make nuclear weapons, had her as the lead negotiator, with John Kerry, with Iran, to make sure Iran had an agreement that would enable them to have nuclear weapons.

And if they lived up to every part of the agreement, this disastrous agreement, as President Trump described it repeatedly during the election and since, they would still have nuclear weapons in 10 years from when the agreement started.

We know—and I went down to the SCIF and reviewed things there. It shouldn't have been classified. It should have been available for the whole country to read. Eventually it was available. But it appeared very clear that the agreement that was enabled by Senator CORKER, yes, he is a Republican, but just wasn't familiar enough with the Constitution as he needed to be, because he thought you could take a treaty, which the Iran deal definitely was because it modified other treaty terms, and you can't do that unless it is in a treaty.

The Constitution requires that a treaty is not valid, a deal such as the Iran agreement, until it is confirmed by two-thirds of the Senate. And I am not saying anything that we didn't say back at the time. I was trying to get the Senate to wake up; that you can't ratify a treaty, which the Iran agreement is, unless you have two-thirds of the Senators voting to ratify, confirm the agreement.

Without two-thirds voting in support of the agreement, there is no agreement. All you have is something on paper that might as well be a memo.

But they acted like it was a deal, and that is why President Obama and John Kerry made sure that the Ayatollah, these radical Islamists that want to end America's existence on the planet as a country in which there is self-representation through a Republican form of government—yet they sent \$100 billion to \$150 billion in cash. And my friend STEVE KING from Iowa, DANA ROHRBACHER, it may have been somebody else, but we went and met with the two lead inspectors in Iran from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA people talk about so much. Oh, yeah, we can be comfortable that the Iran deal is a great deal because those inspectors are carefully inspecting the facilities and any nuclear efforts in Iran.

I even heard one of my friends, whom I have a great deal of respect for, on FOX News this week, saying that: Look, you can't do anything with nuclear material without being detected because there are isotopes that are easily detectable, so the Iranians can't do anything in the way of creating nuclear weapons, moving nuclear material, without us knowing.

I am not sure the source for those comments, but I am sure of the source of my comments. I was asking the two lead inspectors of Iran with the IAEA:

Gee, we just sent \$100 billion or more to Iran. If Iran were to take some of that money, or all of it, and buy ready-made nuclear weapons from Pakistan, which has them, from North Korea, can you guarantee us that they could not get those nuclear weapons into Iran without your knowing?

And the answer was: Of course we cannot guarantee that.

In fact, I was told that the IAEA could set up detection equipment in Iran, say, at an airport or wherever, but they could not set up the detection equipment anywhere without Iran knowing exactly where the detection equipment was; and unless Iran was foolish enough to either bring nuclear material or a nuclear weapon right beside their detection equipment, then no, they would have no way to know whether Iran was bringing nuclear weapons or even nuclear material into Iran.

So I am not sure where this other information comes from, that you can't do anything with nuclear material or weapons without the IAEA knowing, because that is news to the IAEA. They don't know what they don't know, but they know that they don't know if somebody is trying to evade their detection equipment. It is that simple.

So when you have an agreement with people who go out before, after, and during the negotiations and stir up crowds with chants like "Death to America," and you tell people in your country that you want to see America gone, that it is the Great Satan, Israel is the Little Satan, you want them both wiped off the map, wiped off the face of the Earth, you want any evidence that we ever existed eliminated, then you are dealing with a country that cannot be trusted.

Whether you call the radical Islamic leaders in Iran crazy, or just dogmatic jihadists, either way, they are a threat to America. And you send them money, they are likely going to spend it in a way that hurts America, kills Americans, kills Israelis, and makes Iran more dominant in the world.

So all of us who took an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution, if we are sending money to Iran, my opinion, we are grievously violating that oath because they are going to do all they can to subvert our Constitution and, they hope, be able to wipe us out.

Of course, one of their points that was discussed in their Philadelphia meeting over 25 years ago—the FBI had evidence of the meeting and evidence of the things, their goals, what they wanted to accomplish. Well, one of their goals, over 25 years ago, these radical Islamists in America—one of their goals was to subvert the U.S. Constitution to sharia law.

They believed the easiest way to subjugate the U.S. Constitution to their radicalized version of sharia law was to get—either through the courts, through the legislature, or through the U.N., and force countries to adopt what

the U.N. passed as criminal laws in their own countries. There are people here who keep advocating for that. But get a law passed, one way or another, that, in essence, says you cannot say anything negative about radical Islam, and make that a crime, punishable by jail, prison, fine.

So we have been moving that way; that is, in essence, what hate crimes are. Hate crimes, as I said back in 2007, '08, '09, when we were bringing this issue up, I said, really, you don't need a hate crime statute. We were told: Oh, yes, you do, because look at what happened outside of Jasper, Texas. Well, that is just south of my district. None of the people involved were constituents.

But when I heard about what happened, three White men took an African American, had him drug behind their truck, tortured the poor man to death, I wouldn't have a problem if Texas passed a law that said, in a situation like that, somebody is found guilty; then the victim's family, in that case, the Jasper victim, have their family select the manner that the defendant is to be drug and the terrain over which he is to be drug, and who will be dragging him across that terrain.

If we passed a law like that, basically, capital punishment, with a different way of inflicting the capital punishment, I would not object. It is so outrageous what those three defendants did.

But the ridiculous remedy that is proposed here in Congress was: We will fix that situation by providing punishment for hate in somebody's heart, and we will be able to sentence you to life in prison. There is no death penalty for any Federal hate crime.

Actually, this is how ludicrous the law was that was passed here in Congress. If someone were being tried for a hate crime because of the physical assault on someone else, the defendant would be totally, completely exonerated and held not guilty if he raises a reasonable doubt that, no, no, I didn't choose somebody because of their race, gender, any type of group they were part of. No, I just wanted to arbitrarily kill somebody, abuse somebody. I didn't care what group they were part of.

Under the Federal law, that person would have to be acquitted of the Federal hate crime because they chose their victim randomly, or at least raised reasonable doubt that they may have chosen the victim randomly so they are not guilty of this heinous crime.

Whereas, under Texas law, if you harm somebody, it is not nearly as important the feelings you have in your heart as what you did. And under Texas law, the two most culpable defendants in that case, in my opinion, properly got the death penalty, and the least culpable person got life in prison.

So this case, which was heralded as the great poster case for why we need a

Federal hate crime, actually would diminish the punishment that the defendants in a hate crime case would get. They couldn't get the death penalty anymore. Oh, no; they will get life in a Federal prison instead of death under Texas law.

We did not need that hate crime. And as I said years ago when this bill was being pushed, ultimately, what this hate crime bill will be used for is to punish Christians, Christian ministers, for reading verses directly out of the Bible, as has been done in Congress, in the House and Senate since the very beginning of this Nation.

□ 1345

And now we are starting to see it being used as a threat against Christians. We hear more and more people say the biggest hate group threat is Evangelical Christians.

Well, if they are real Christians, they cannot have hate in their heart for others, and yet they are being called the biggest threat as potential hate criminals.

It needs to be changed. We need to punish people for what they do wrong, and not whether or not they had some improper thought in their head.

But I am grateful that countries look at Donald Trump the way they looked at Ronald Reagan, because it is helpful historically.

“Saturday Night Live,” seems like I recall Reagan's character being portrayed as walking around with a finger out wanting to push the red button so he could launch missiles with nuclear weapons on them, and the world said: Wow, this Reagan guy is really crazy.

It is invaluable for foreign leaders to not be sure about the American President, because that gives them more negotiating power.

It is kind of like a great poker player, except that Donald Trump indicates clearly he doesn't bluff. And as he pointed out to North Korea, he is not bluffing. And though he would rather not take the actions that are required, he will take them, and I believe he will, and apparently Kim Jong-un believed he would as well.

So if you look historically, Teddy Roosevelt has his Navy go around the world. People are going: This guy is crazy. Look, he just sent his Navy around the world. You don't know what this guy is going to do. Run up San Juan Hill? Who knows? This guy is a little bit crazy. And it always was helpful in foreign relations.

Now, Khrushchev took the measure of John F. Kennedy, very intelligent man, who wanted to protect America, but he was not decisive in his early days. Khrushchev scared him out of following through on his promise to provide air cover to those going into Cuba to try to eliminate Castro. Scared him off. Backed him off of his promise to provide him air support. So people were killed who were relying on President Kennedy's promise.

President Kennedy gave a speech and said, in essence: We are not going to let

anybody build a wall and wall off part of Germany, Eastern Europe. And it was just, as I recall, a couple of weeks or so before Khrushchev ensured that the bricks were being laid and the wall was started.

They had a meeting in Vienna, and President Kennedy told people he didn't do well in the negotiating, that Khrushchev scared him and he didn't represent America well.

Well, that is not going to happen to Donald Trump. He is not going to go to into a negotiation with Kim Jong-un or the Ayatollah or anybody else and go in and come back out as President Kennedy did and confide: Wow, I really showed weakness. I didn't do a good job. He scared me. That is not going to be our problem under President Donald Trump, and our country is going to be better off because of it.

So I applaud President Trump for rightfully taking the step to discount and discontinue the farce that was the Iran treaty. It was not properly ratified.

And even though I wish we had had President Trump in place to stop the hundred-plus billion dollars that President Obama and John Kerry sent to the biggest suppliers of terrorism, no doubt that money will be used or has been used to kill Americans, but there is a new sheriff in town, and President Trump is going to make sure that doesn't happen again. God bless him for stopping the Iranian farce.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, Public Law 115–123, requires the chairs of the House and Senate Budget Committees to submit for printing in the Congressional Record committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2019.

Pursuant to section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record: (1) an allocation for fiscal year 2019 for the House Committee on Appropriations, (2) committee allocations for fiscal year 2019 and for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2028 for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, and (3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2019 and aggregate revenue levels for fiscal year 2019 and for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2028.

In the case of allocations for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations and for the spending and revenue aggregates, the levels shall be consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's most recent baseline, adjusted to account for any legislation enacted since the date the most recent baseline was issued.

This filing is made for technical purposes as required by section 30104 the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018. Associated tables are attached. These committee allocations, aggre-

gates, and other budgetary levels are made for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

If there are any questions on these committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels please contact Brad Watson or Mary Popadiuk of the Budget Committee staff.

FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET TOTALS

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2019	Fiscal Years 2019–2028
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	3,747,016	n.a.
Outlays	3,551,514	n.a.
Revenues	2,590,496	33,273,213

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2020 through 2028 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

		2019
Base Discretionary Action:	BA OT	1,244,000 1,296,937
Current Law Mandatory:	BA OT	955,283 949,351

SPENDING AUTHORITY FOR HOUSE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES

(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

		2019	2019–2028
Agriculture:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	79,138 75,363	798,019 789,258
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	79,138 75,363	798,019 789,258
Armed Services:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	168,445 168,196	1,726,658 1,731,206
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	168,445 168,196	1,726,658 1,731,206
Financial Services:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	10,945 1,309	93,416 –15,600
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	10,945 1,309	93,416 –15,600
Education & Workforce:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	5,533 –1,272	101,151 60,439
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	5,533 –1,272	101,151 60,439
Energy & Commerce:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	503,196 491,423	6,933,428 6,843,460
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	503,196 491,423	6,933,428 6,843,460
Foreign Affairs:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	43,383 36,211	380,040 362,848
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	43,383 36,211	380,040 362,848
Oversight & Government Reform:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	123,611 121,472	1,424,908 1,386,092
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	123,611 121,472	1,424,908 1,386,092
Homeland Security:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	2,325 2,404	26,861 27,608
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	2,325 2,404	26,861 27,608
House Administration:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	23	170

SPENDING AUTHORITY FOR HOUSE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—Continued

(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

		2019	2019–2028
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	OT	–4	–41
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	23	170
	OT	–4	–41
Natural Resources:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	7,149	68,932
	OT	6,286	67,606
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA	0	0
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	7,149	68,932
	OT	6,286	67,606
Judiciary:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	23,739	149,941
	OT	16,123	160,588
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA	0	0
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	23,739	149,941
	OT	16,123	160,588
Transportation & Infrastructure:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	77,689	731,235
	OT	17,366	180,979
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA	0	0
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	77,689	731,235
	OT	17,366	180,979
Science, Space & Technology:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	143	1,427
	OT	126	1,383
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA	0	0
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	143	1,427
	OT	126	1,383
Small Business:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA	0	0
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Veterans Affairs:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	3,986	153,542
	OT	5,681	156,605
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA	0	0
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	3,986	153,542
	OT	5,681	156,605
Ways & Means:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	1,192,661	16,896,406
	OT	1,191,147	16,891,082
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA	0	0
	BA	0	0
	OT	0	0
Total	BA	1,192,661	16,896,406
	OT	1,191,147	16,891,082

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3210. An act to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 57. Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Indirect Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act”.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 11, 2018, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4776. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled “Strategic and Critical Materials Operations Report To Congress: Operations under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during Fiscal Year 2017”, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(a); June 7, 1939, ch. 190, Sec. 11(a) (as amended by Public Law 103-35, Sec. 204(d)); (107 Stat. 103); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4777. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the report on defense contracting fraud, due no later than June 10, 2018, or 180 days after the enactment of the Act, will be submitted no later than the end of September 2018, pursuant to Sec. 889 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4778. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the report presenting the specific amount of staff years of technical effort (STE) to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) during the subsequent FY 2019 and the associated budget estimates, pursuant to Sec. 8024(e) of H.R. 1625, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Public Law 115-141; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4779. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that in place of the Federally Funded Research and Development Center analysis, the Reform Leader for Service Contracts and Category Management, welcomes the opportunity to provide an update to Congress on the development of a budget request for the full Future Years Defense Program within the next six months, if desired, pursuant to House Report 115-404, Sec. 851, accompanying H.R. 2810, and the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4780. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense, transmitting a report relating to ISIS captives, pursuant to House Report 115-404, the conference report accompanying H.R. 2810, and the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4781. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2016 Performance Report to Congress for the Office of Combination Products, pursuant to the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002, Public Law 107-250; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4782. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4783. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4784. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4785. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4786. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period of December 1, 2016, through January 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4787. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec. 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4788. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 115–121); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

4789. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331 (H. Doc. No. 115–119); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

4790. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 115–120); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

4791. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075 (H. Doc. No. 115–122); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

4792. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1120; Product Identifier 2017-CE-030-AD; Amendment 39-1924; AD 2018-07-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4793. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0288; Product Identifier 2017-CE-007-AD; Amendment 39-19231; AD 2018-06-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4794. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0810; Product Identifier 2017-NM-045-AD; Amendment 39-19240; AD 2018-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4795. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0668; Product Identifier 2017-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-19236; AD 2018-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4796. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0805; Product Identifier 2017-NM-051-AD; Amendment 39-19235; AD 2018-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4797. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1119; Product Identifier 2017-CE-037-AD; Amendment 39-19241; AD 2018-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4798. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0170; Product Identifier 2017-SW-091-AD; Amendment 39-19239; AD 2018-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4799. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Twin Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0969; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-18] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4800. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2907C, R-2910B, R-2910C, and R-2910E; Pinecastle, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0103; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-1] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4801. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31181; Amdt. No.: 3789] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4802. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31182; Amdt. No.: 3790] received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4803. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of The President, transmitting a set of legislative proposals to help streamline and improve the agility and efficiency of the Federal acquisition processes; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Oversight and Government Reform.

4804. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 115th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1026. A bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3746. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to clarify the authority of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection with respect to persons regulated by a State insurance regulator, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 5745. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct Federal research in fossil energy and to promote the development and demonstration of environmentally responsible coal and natural gas technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,

and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 5746. A bill to amend the Cyber Scholarship Program of the Department of Defense to require additional considerations in the award of scholarships and grants under the Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income compensation of members of the Armed Forces assigned to special operations forces who serve in support of certain operations combating terrorism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5748. A bill to deauthorize portions of the project for raising and improving existing levees on the Walluski River in Clatsop County, Oregon; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 5749. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared options, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 5750. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to impose e-bonding requirements on certain nonimmigrant visa applicants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 5751. A bill to redesignate Golden Spike National Historic Site and to establish the Transcontinental Railroad Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5752. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5753. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public domain lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 5754. A bill to promote free and fair elections, political freedoms, and human rights in Cambodia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in

addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5755. A bill to authorize community development block grants for providing tools, equipment, and other resources; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 5756. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to adjust certain resubmission thresholds for shareholder proposals; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 5757. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the permissive exclusion from Federal health programs to include certain individuals with prior interest in sanctioned entities and entities affiliated with sanctioned entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5758. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Fairlawn, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. MCMORRIS, Mr. RODGERS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 5759. A bill to improve executive agency digital services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 5760. A bill to provide for congressional review of the imposition of duties and other trade measures by the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 5761. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit to the Congress on a biennial basis a national plan to reduce the rate of maternal mortality; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5762. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize a Joint Task Force to enhance integration of the Department of Homeland Security's border security operations to detect, interdict, disrupt, and prevent narcotics, such as fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, from entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr.

DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5763. A bill to implement the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 5764. A bill to amend the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 to require peer review for value-added agricultural product market development grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 5765. A bill to amend the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 to extend the availability of identity protection coverage to individuals whose personally identifiable information was compromised during recent data breaches at Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 5766. A bill to improve the security of public areas of transportation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 5767. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 5768. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes outpatient self-management training services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5769. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access under the Medicare program to addiction treatment in Federally qualified health centers and rural health clinics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5770. A bill to direct the Attorney General to amend certain regulations so that practitioners may administer not more than 3 days' medication to a person at one time when administering narcotic drugs for the purpose of relieving acute withdrawal symptoms; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 5771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the deduction for

charitable contributions as an above-the-line deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 5772. A bill to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the "J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.J. Res. 134. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms an individual may serve as a Member of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H. Res. 886. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Brooke rule is essential to ensuring affordable rent levels for families receiving Federal rental assistance; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FASO (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H. Res. 887. A resolution supporting the designation of May as "National Lyme Disease Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DEMINGS:

H. Res. 888. A resolution reaffirming support for increased media diversity, expressing support for the recognition of the month of May as "Media Diversity Month", and encouraging appreciation, awareness, and support for small, independent, diverse, and local media entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 889. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H. Res. 890. A resolution recognizing the National Association of Letter Carriers' one-day food drive; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

196. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 220, urging Congress and the Federal Communications Commission to codify a definition of the "Public Interest Standard" for the broadcasting industry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

197. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 109, urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to grant full veterans benefits to Filipino veterans who fought in World War II but were subsequently denied the benefits to which they were entitled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 5745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 5747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment.16. "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration"

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 5749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 5750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 5 of Article I Section 8.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section. 8, Clause 3—"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 5755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 5756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 5757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 5759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section IX, clause VII, of the United States

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—"the United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations"

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 5761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 5762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VII, Clause 3

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 5763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 5766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 5767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 5769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 5772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 (To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court)

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.J. Res. 134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V (Article 5—Mode of Amendment)

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 35: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 173: Mr. HURD and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 203: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 233: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 237: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 548: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 869: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 980: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1046: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1048: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1078: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1142: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1205: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1212: Mr. KIND and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1270: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1276: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1305: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1318: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1322: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 1358: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1409: Mr. RUSH and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1622: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1683: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1772: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1828: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1881: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1972: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2076: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2147: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2234: Mr. SCHIFF.

- H.R. 2369: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2570: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H.R. 2591: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2623: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2640: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2803: Mr. LANCE and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2845: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2856: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 3030: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 3032: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3160: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3331: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mrs. HANDEL.
H.R. 3409: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 3528: Mrs. HANDEL.
H.R. 3605: Mr. KIND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3613: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 3832: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3931: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 3940: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4114: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4253: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4256: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4275: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4284: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 4345: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 4391: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4472: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 4571: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4606: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4680: Mr. SOTO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 4682: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 4684: Mrs. HANDEL.
H.R. 4691: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4760: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 4841: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4881: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4897: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4941: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4953: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 4983: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5001: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 5038: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5060: Mr. LANCE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FASO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 5102: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 5105: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 5132: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WALKER, Mr. COLE, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 5138: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 5153: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5171: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5223: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5251: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 5353: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5358: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5385: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5424: Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 5435: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 5460: Mr. LANCE and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5467: Ms. MOORE and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5524: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 5531: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 5573: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 5600: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 5634: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5640: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 5674: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. BOST, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5677: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 5681: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 5684: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5693: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 5698: Mr. DUNN and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5710: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5728: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 5736: Mrs. HANDEL.
H.J. Res. 129: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 401: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 785: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BACON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H. Res. 835: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H. Res. 861: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 881: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 60: Mr. YOHIO.
H.R. 1468: Ms. MCSALLY.
H. Res. 774: Mr. CRAWFORD.